

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXXII.

APRIL, 1870.

ARTICLE I.

GOD'S CARE OF HIS CHURCH AS EXHIBITED IN THE
REFORMATION.*

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

The strong care of the Divine Love over the Church is most strikingly assured in the words of the Redeemer: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Full protection is forever guaranteed. Jesus saw that the Church He was founding on His own atonement, would be tried both by the power and treachery of the counsels adopted against it in the gates of hell, sometimes drenched in the violence of wrath, sometimes imperiled amid the fair deceptions of unsuspected strategy. But God from above is mightier than power and treachery from beneath. The first and plainest idea of the promise is assured safety. But it is the safety which Love pledges and gives. He that touches the Church touches the apple of Jehovah's eye. It is in the centre of His heart, and therefore, can-

*Discourse, on the Anniversary of the Reformation, delivered in the College Church, Gettysburg, Oct. 31, 1869.

not be plucked from His hand. Thus the passage becomes a disclosure of the sure guardianship of God's love over His Church. In this sense, we wish to apply it. Never, perhaps, was there a more striking illustration of it, than in the Reformation. Never, probably, as during the six long, dark centuries preceding, had the steady, artful malice of the gates of hell seemed so near prevailing against the Church. Never, more signally than in the Reformation, did Love lift up a banner against the adversary; and, against the violence of wrath and power, bear it on to victory.

In this divine care of the Church, as exhibited in that blessed interposition, there are three prominent features, to which attention must be called. They may be marked as its *Providential*, its *Doctrinal*, and its *Practical* aspects. In these three points, the divine promise has received most striking illustration.

I. ITS PROVIDENTIAL ASPECT.

In the peculiar combination of external providences, concurring in the accomplishment of the Reformation, there is a marked display of God's careful love. An apocalypse of His love may be given in the dealings of His providence as truly as in acts of redemption. These dealings are, in fact, points of its outshining, to which He calls the view of men:—"Behold I,"—in the ordering of providence,—*"will make them of the Synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, but are not, to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee."* Rev. 8:9.

Full of God as History is, few events in its annals present more manifest and striking displays of His ruling providence than the Reformation. Few periods have been so full of the signs of His guiding presence. As plainly as in Israel's march from the brick-yards of On, through sea and wilderness, under God's pillar of fire and cloud, did His hand appear in this deliverance. It shines all through it. In every movement and at every turn, in the separate acts, and in their varied combinations, involutions, and evolutions, in all the stirring and sublime procession of its great events, the proof of His guiding arm of care is seen flashing out. While the ship was laboring through the storm and waves, He who sits on the throne, with all power in His hands, was holding the

helm, to bring it out under clear sky, and on peaceful sea. A few particulars will best illustrate.

1. *It is seen in the needful antecedent preparation for the work.* Sudden and abrupt as that religious revolution seems to have been, and really was, God had long been preparing the way, and marshaling the agencies and forces for its accomplishment. Epochs of history are not immediately and sharply sundered from each other, but the later usually has its causes in the earlier, and in turn, becomes the soil in which the succeeding is rooted. As confluent streams look to the formation of the river, the bending lines of many events were pointing to this grand religious restoration. Providence had brought the errors and corruptions of the Church into glaring and painful disclosure, and awakened a deep longing for a reformation. The consciously felt need of a disenthraling and purifying change had been long and urgently announcing itself. There was a profound impulse to throw off the burden; and the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have been marked on the pages of history, as a period of frequent reformatory effort. The sighs of anxious hearts were heard in heaven, and incipient endeavors began to break the quiet of many parts of Christendom. England, France, Germany, and Italy had been made to feel the agitating movements which heralded the coming deliverance. Such men as Wickliffe at Oxford, Wesel at Erfurt, Huss and Jerome at Prague, and Savonarola at Florence, were sent as fore-runners of the fulness of the appointed time—John Baptists, to prepare the way. These Reformers *before* the Reformation failed; for the times were not yet ripe. But their labors, and martyr-blood helped to ripen them.

Along with this, was the revival of learning, out of the intellectual degeneracy and decay of the Middle Ages, opening anew the treasures of classical and scholastic lore, and awakening literary and philosophical pursuits. The Art of Printing, invented in 1440, seems to have been just sent by Heaven, to scatter these fruits of learning among the nations, and to fall into the hands of the Reformers, to enlighten the earth from the Bible, and carry on the conflict of truth with the powers of error and darkness. This revival of learning, together with the art of printing, provided philological, philosophical, and general knowledge, without which the faithful interpretation and translation of the Scriptures, the needed revision of

dogmatic theology, and the rapid enlightenment of the popular mind, and enlisting of the popular heart, which marked the Reformation, could hardly have been successfully accomplished. Such men as Agricola, Reuchlin, and Erasmus appear to have been sent to collect the scattered materials, for the reconstruction of the temple of sacred knowledge. Circumstances were moving into readiness. In unmistakeable clearness, God was guiding the varied procession of events, in straight, sharp lines, to the hour when he would put a divine commission into the hands of Luther.

2. *An item, in this providential aspect, is seen in the preparation of Luther.* When God has a special work to be done, he provides and prepares the instrument for it. A Noah for a witness to the antediluvians and rescue of the race by the Ark—a Moses for the deliverance of an enslaved nation—a Samson for judgment on Philistine tribes—a David for the service of song in the house of the Lord—a Paul for the grand missionary labor in the infant Church—all this method is continued in a Luther for the Reformation. When God's love for his Church called for a successful Reformer, his providence and training provided one.

Bringing Luther's early life under the light of his appointed mission, it is seen to be full of the planning and moulding care of God. From the very first, God plainly said of him, as he said of Saul of Tarsus, "*He is a chosen vessel unto me.*" His youth was cast into hardships, but they could not repress him, or arrest his course. They were the early burdens, by carrying which, his soul was to develop the muscle and nerve of a conquering strength. He who charged the waters of the Nile not to destroy Moses, gave charge to the waves of time, on which Luther's early life was cast. The selection of a reformer from the hardy race of miners among the hills of Eisleben, his compulsory songs, in which he came into victory over the privation and hardships of his school days, the diversion of his mind from Jurisprudence to Theology, by the sudden death of his friend Alexis, his deep conviction of sin by the Holy Spirit, who is sent to convince of it, the severe discipline and instructive experiment of mistaken monastic life, the throwing into his way of the long hidden Word of God, the intense spiritual conflicts, and the profound spiritual experiences, through which God brought

him into a clear and stable apprehension of the way of salvation and the truths of the gospel, the imbedding in his deep soul of the great heart-doctrine of the cross—justification by faith—the insight given him of the corruptions of Rome, by sending him there to look into the home-workings of the “mystery of iniquity,”—all these things exhibit the clear and direct lines of Providential preparation and guidance for his appointed work. God thus brought him out into a clear view of Christianity, and it lay before him as a newly discovered land, through which he was to lead the way of others. In the endowments and training of his co-laborers, and the correlation of their intellectual and spiritual characteristics to their assigned and necessary parts in the great work, the same Providence is manifest. Whilst the faltering mildness of Melancthon, for instance, would have disqualified him for pressing on the leading, aggressive movement, yet, in mutual co-operation with the impetuous ardor of Luther, his gentleness and culture added elements of safety and strength to the sublime revolution. But, in the training of Luther himself, as the unquestioned leader in the great work, we have sufficient illustration of the point, of which we speak. In the reformation of this chief Reformer, the whole Reformation had been carried on in miniature, and all its fundamental principles and life had been given. The same Providence that prepared the times, most marvelously provided and fitted the agent for the ordained work.

3. *A most striking feature of this providential care is seen in the combination of varied national and governmental circumstances, by which the movement was protected, from its beginning to its accomplishment, from the power and machination of its enemies.* This is illustrated in a number of particulars:

(1) In its very commencement, a loving Providence is seen, affording it the counsel and protection of the Elector, Frederick the Wise. Few princes have been so prudent, just, and firm in trying circumstances. Rarely has history presented one who could have met the emergency so well. His establishment of the University of Wittenberg, not only showed his noble love of learning, but founded the seat of the Reformer's power. All through the early perils of the Reformation, his unyielding determination and favor raised a bulwark about the person and work of Lu-

ther and his co-laborers. Neither the displeasure of Pope nor Emperor could break the strength of the shield which he held outstretched for the evangelical cause. Surely God was kind, and his providence was clear, in giving the power and wisdom of such a prince for the sheltering of the feeble cause. He appears to have specially raised him up, and endowed him, for this service. The page of history will ever present his relation to the Reformation as a striking illustration of the ways of Providence. "His memory," says Salig, "will be blessed as long as the Lutheran Church exists on earth."* All Protestant Christendom is enjoying the fruit of his services.

(2) The Providence that thus took in hand the holy cause, was never afterward withdrawn. That hand was soon again revealed. A storm of hierarchical and secular wrath soon rose over the Reformation, and burst forth in the edicts and bans of the Diet of Worms. A word of doom went forth against Luther and his adherents. The imperial decree meant all the bitterness of death. The guiding hand of God, however, moving the plans of the Elector, thwarted the wrath of foes, in a sudden withdrawal of Luther to the Wartburg. This was clearly the voice of heaven, saying, as once of old: "Come, enter thou into thy chamber, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were for a little moment until the indignation be overpast;" Is. 26 : 20. But history adds the further statement,—"Divine Providence took his cause more effectually under its protection, by at once crippling and arresting the execution of the sentence of extermination, by the war in which the Emperor was immediately entangled with France."†

(3) Again, after the Diet of Augsburg, at which our great Confession, which has been ever since shaping the theology of Protestant Christendom, was read, the recess now ordered the execution of the suspended edict of Worms. For nine years, between the arrest of the edict of Worms (1521) to the recess, or edict, of Augsburg, the work of the Church's deliverance and restoration had been going on, always through difficulties, and sometimes bitter persecution and the flow of martyr-blood—a clear line of real progress, even through the sore trials of fanatic disturbance and peasant wars. But now, through a juncture of circumstances seemingly favoring their wishes, the uni-

*Hist. Augs. Conf.

†Glessler IV p. 58.

ted Papal and Imperial powers felt strong enough to carry out the delayed purpose of extermination. The peril was impending. The prospect darkened into alarming gloom. The Smalcaldic League lifted its banner for defence, weak and comparatively helpless as it was. But He who makes the wrath of man to praise him—using even his foes for his purposes of love—caused the Emperor to see three hundred thousand Turks, under the warrior Sultan, Soliman, on his imperial borders. God thus said to him, "Thus far mayest thou go, but here shall thy proud wrath be stayed." Thus the relation of the parties was so changed, that at the next Diet the Protestants were not the suppliant party, but the besought. The moving thousands of the Sultan left the thwarted Emperor no resource but to compromise. And thus, the first *Nuremberg Peace*, though brought to the Protestants by the hands of the Turks, was sent by God.

(4) Subsequently, the Turks being defeated by the help of the Protestants, the Emperor, unfaithful to given pledges, and ungrateful for received aid, persistent and true only to his hatred of the Reformation, and irritated especially by the Protestant alienation of Wurtemberg from his house, determined, again, to inflict the blow.* But in the revolving providences of God, an arrest was again put upon his movements. His hands were restrained by the threatened descent of the bold pirate Chaireddin, from Tunis, on his Italian and Spanish States. And as soon as the corsair was defeated, a war with the emperor, Francis I., of France, engaged all his energies and resources. So, again held back just when he was ready to overwhelm, he was compelled to seek the aid of those whom he had been planning to destroy.

(5) Still later, when the pressure of disability was apparently lifted off of him, when his prospects were clearing up brightly, and he was fortified in his purposes, and expectations of success, by the Nuremberg League, signed by the Roman Catholic States, for the execution of the recess of Augsburg against the Protestants, a guardian God once more stopped the eager Emperor, and by touching the course of events with His divine hand, and turning them, like the clouds, whithersoever He would, involved him in political complications and helplessness which should have

*Kurtz, Ch. Hist. II. pp. 78, and 81.

drawn from him the recognition, "O, God, Thou hast done it." The States of the Smalcaldic League, having seen the coming storm, and recognized the imminent peril, had drawn closely together and compacted their inadequate strength, expecting to have to meet violence with violence, or sink beneath the sweep of the papal and imperial power. But they had only to "stand still, and see the salvation of God." His special love was still pavillioning His holy cause. After the last baffled attempt of its foes, He had been restraining "the remainder of wrath," still left in smothered burning, until the broken power of Soliman was recovered; and when the Emperor is once more ready to strike,—lo, the Turks again!

These are instances and illustrations of the over-ruling care of Him who had, ages before, said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail." It is interesting to note how many things God marshaled in the turns, movements, and procession of his providences. The circumstances of the times, the balance of political power between Pope and Emperor and Princes, the disturbed state of foreign relations, the strange turns of internal policy, the almost ceaseless hostility and threatening of Frank and Turk, and pirate, all these things kept both angry Pope and chafing Emperor involved in complication after complication, so that while they, all the time, wished to arrest the Reformation, they never could do it. Whenever they thought that their hands were free, the manacles of an arresting Providence were, again and again, put upon them, and new concessions were forced from them for the Protestant cause.

II. THE DOCTRINAL ASPECT.

In this, no less than in the Providential aspect, God's loving care of his Church is seen. The *doctrines* of the gospel are the arteries and veins for the flow of the life-blood of Christianity through the Church. It was largely through a corruption of these, that her woes had come on her, and the gates of hell had been threatening to succeed. Her salvation was to be secured through a doctrinal reformation. The principle was to be fulfilled again: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

The two chief doctrinal aspects of the Reformation are marked and unmistakeable. They are made to stand out in bold relief, on the pages of history, in what are known

as the formal and material principles of the great change.

1. In the formal principle, we have the doctrine of the supreme and sole authority of the word of God, as the Rule of faith and practice in the Church. Into this God led the movement, through the decisive experience of Luther, already mentioned. In being able to find the way of salvation only through the direct teaching of the Bible, the Bible was, at the very beginning, put into its long-lost, but essential place and authority in the Church. The lesson was effectually learned, that the Holy Scriptures were to settle the doctrine and practice of Christians. The voice of God which went out through the darkness that had then rested on Christendom for centuries, "*Let there be light*," was an imperative summoning of His word into its divine authority and liberty in the Church. In the revival of religion, after its decay in the Jewish commonwealth, the long-neglected Law was brought forth and read to the people. So Luther brought forth and read the Bible. This fact not only became his power, but the power and security of the Church ever since. The strength of the Reformation was, that it was not only *by* the Bible, but *to* the Bible. The fact ran into doctrine—the doctrine, that in all faith and practice, the Holy Scriptures are the only authoritative and sufficient rule. It was made a first principle for all Protestantism. By this doctrine God has anchored the Church forever to safe moorings. If it is the sum of all woes to the Church, to drift away from the simple teachings of the Gospel, if this prepares for the incoming and prevalence of every kind of destructive error, if it is a part of the adversary's ceaseless effort, to cause men to make shipwreck of hope through a perversion or denial of the faith, if the whole Church, by neglecting the chart of the Scriptures, may become as a ship without star or compass, drifted off on dark seas, amid rocks and bars and varying currents, if all the transcendent interests of immortal souls are wrapped up in the preservation of the pure and saving truth as it is in Jesus, then, we cannot but be impressed with the love of God to His Church, in binding up the whole reformation movement to this fundamental law of the supreme and only authority of the Word of God in the faith and practice of His people. It was an essential starting point for a safe reform. It was an indispensable condition to subsequent security. By thus installing

again the supreme authority of the Scriptures in the Church, making her adopt, as a life-principle, the law of sitting at the feet of Christ, through a study of it, and taking it as the fountain of doctrine and the arbiter of controversies, the Reformation broke forever the tyranny of pope and priest and councils. The blessings will go down through the ages. It was the effectual word of God's love, saying: "The gates of hell shall not prevail."

2. The other chief doctrinal aspect to be noted, is the still more striking *material principle* of the Reformation,—the great doctrine of *Justification by faith*. We all know that the entire doctrine of salvation had been deeply corrupted, and the gate of heaven hidden from a perishing world. The chief point of the entrance of this corruption was the notion of work-righteousness and human merit. From this false notion, perverting errors ran in every direction. With wrong views of sin and human helplessness, men were led to depend on their own good deeds, penances, and self-mortifications, for acceptance before God. The only way of salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ, was hidden from view. Not only were the subordinate doctrines darkened under the shadows of this error, but the entire Church-life was corrupted, in all its manifestations.

But now the loving care of God is seen in restoring the vital truth, whose perversion had darkened all. He applied the corrective of all in one. Shaping the doctrinal development of the movement from Luther's own deep and clear experience of the way of salvation, He caused this great, essential, and all-including doctrine of the Gospel, *Justification by Faith*, to appear as its vital and most prominent feature, rising high above every thing else in the conflict. It was the Protestant grasp on this doctrine, which marked the point where the heart of the struggle was felt to be. The Reformation could never have been wrought by any, or all, of the doctrines which lie on the circumference of the Christian system, outside of its heart, or moving about its doctrinal periphery. But with its roots in deep personal experience of sin and helplessness, the movement was divinely guided, from the very first, to the recovery and establishment of this fundamental doctrine of the Gospel—the doctrine which itself is the Gospel, the glad-tidings of salvation. The great truth went forth as the divine light through the Church's gloom.

The way of life lay, open and plain again, to the view of men,—“Justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” “By grace are ye saved, through faith.”

It is a shining exhibition of the loving care of the great Head of the Church, that attention was not now allowed to be taken up and absorbed by minor, collateral, or incidental truths, or practices, or directed simply to the lopping off of abuses and reforming the outward order of the Church, but that the movement seized and recovered this central and all-inclusive doctrine, in which every thing else is recovered. It is to be borne in mind that men are very prone to go off in side directions, and in giving undue importance to secondary things, or their own little notions, to lose sight of fundamental and essential points. The history of that very period presents sad, but instructive, facts, which illustrate the need of supernatural guidance, to save from the destructive results of this tendency. *Fanaticism* did run off from the heart-doctrine of the Reformation, and the melancholy excesses and disorders thus brought to the surface, show into what wreck and ruin such mistake would have sunk the Church, had it become general. But God, in His watchful kindness, had so vivified the grand work with the doctrine of justification by faith—so bound up the very life of the Reformation with this mighty truth—that the onward movement, through all its perils, remained true to the Gospel, true to the Church, and true to the blood-bought souls of men. Thus, whilst the Papacy fell from grace by the loss of this doctrine, the Church rose, in renewed power by its recovery, and stands, not in ossified, but living, strength, with all its life compacted in divine symmetry around it—every other doctrine and truth falling into its place, in the unity and harmony of the everlasting gospel of the grace of God.

We cannot be too grateful that the Reformation, destined to send its own characterizing features and forces down the centuries of subsequent history, was formed around the *real* centre of the Gospel. If the Church, as it moved on from that period, was not absolutely right in all its details of truth, or fully reformed in all its order and practice, its heart-truth, and all-regulative doctrine, were right. God restored to it, fully, the inner life-doc-

trine, which strongly tends to make all right,—to assimilate to itself all God's truth, and reject everything else. In this, as well as in restoring the authority of the inspired word, God's love was carefully providing for the security of the Church for after times. For it is only to the Church, that holds forever to Justification by faith, "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," against which the gates of hell shall never prevail.

III. ITS PRACTICAL ASPECT.

The Practical aspect of the Reformation relates to *life*, both ecclesiastical and personal.

1. Without doubt, Christianity is a "life," and any reformatory movement which should not be pervaded by this idea would be false and barren. Christ's words "are spirit, and they are life." All doctrine is for life, as the tree is for fruits. Its end is not in itself but beyond itself, in renovated, redeemed character. Its fruit is to be life, power, sanctification, and all the holy activities of regenerate humanity. It is, under the Holy Spirit, to bring forth the life of Christ into constant manifestation in mortal flesh.

2. The Reformation was made to proceed from the practical idea, and developed as a power of divine life to the Church. Having its birth in a deep experience of grace, and earnest personal religion, it became a revival of living Christianity. It wrought from within outward. Luther, having come into the light through an inner work of the most thorough and vital kind, with a soul all alive to God and duty, could do no superficial work. In his conception, Christianity, was a religion of the heart and of practical power. In his labors, he was concerned, not with doctrine for its own sake, but as the regenerating truth in the midst of life. It was manifestly not the purpose of God, to allow the work to become a simple mending of the outward form, order, or ritual of the Church. He taught the great man whom he employed as his chief instrument, that if the Church were once filled with the pure truth of the Gospel, and the power of Christ's life, its outward reform would occur as a matter of course. The necessity of this *vital* element is made apparent in the failure of the earlier reformatory efforts. For more than two centuries these movements had been rising on the surface of ecclesiastical affairs. But by attempting the reform, as it is said, only

"in the head and members," and not in *spirit*—not from the inward life, going outward—the efforts failed. They were but as a pruning of wild branches, instead of making the tree good, and *so*, the fruit good. Here it was, at least in part, that the reformers before the Reformation missed their true power and success. But God's time being now come for the deliverance of his Church, he made the movement take this character, in which alone the Church could arise and shine, and stand forth again, as the power of regeneration, life, purity, and salvation to the world. And the Reformation came into victory over the Papacy,—and it holds the power of ceaseless victory,—not only by having the true faith, but also the *life* of the true faith. Its faith was shown by its works, and "by works was faith made perfect."

It must be recognized as showing the loving care of God over his Church, that, in the Reformation, it was made to combine the living, practical element with the doctrinal, in true and beautiful harmony. It is, perhaps, harder for the Church to retain this element, than purity of doctrine. The life of the Church usually first departs—then the eagles of error and heresy to the carcass. And we may say that, had the Church continued in the line of this first period, holding all the results already reached in doctrine, and steadily and vigorously developing its true life and practical power—had it not divorced doctrine from life, leaving orthodoxy stand as the only essential, although cold and uninfluential—there would have been no need or occasion, at a later day, for the earnest labors and struggles of the pietistic workers, whose conflicts with a lifeless Churchism have given their names honorably, and even grandly, to the Christian world. And more—there would have been little room for the inroads of that fearful neology and rationalism of still later time, bringing on a period which even the efforts of pietism could not prevent, though they stayed the advancing flood. But it is to be remembered with lively gratitude to God, that his guiding love, in reviving the Church in the sixteenth century, he made it so truly a *living* Church, that it can never be wholly and permanently turned from this law of its divine constitution. It was only by such revival of its life, that he could insure it against the gates of hell.

This view of the interposing love and guiding provi-

dence of God, on behalf of his Church, gives emphasis to several practical thoughts:

1. We should be deeply thankful to God for the Reformation. There are some who are not. While we are able to trace the loving providence of the Lord, like a line of silver, through the history of that era,—while we see how, both in doctrinal and practical aspects, he was restoring and saving to man, all that is great and priceless as the continued fruit of redemption,—there are those, bearing the Protestant name, who undervalue and depreciate this work, and, treating the Reformation as a mistake and failure, are setting their faces Romeward. They appear to be closing their eyes to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. They seem blind to the lessons of history. They turn away from the signet of heaven put upon Protestantism in its liberating, uplifting, purifying energy among the nations, upraising the race, wherever it goes, as on a wave of before unattained sanctity, power, enterprise and moral elevation. While a few choice spirits in the Church of Rome, are beginning to see some of the false positions of the Papacy, and seem to be coming into broader and nobler conceptions of the gospel, these false Protestants are hankering after the supposed unity of Romanism, apparently ready to lay down their private judgment and manhood at the feet of the grand usurper and despot of Christendom. I think we may see the trouble with these misguided men. We have seen, that the characterizing feature of the Reformation was the bringing out of the great, central, all-inclusive doctrine, and the real *life*, of Christianity. It was a subordination of everything else to these grand and fundamental things of the gospel. But the course of these men shows that they are letting these great and essential things slip, in reaching after something else. Never could they go toward Rome, except by losing sight of the very heart of the gospel,—the doctrine of justification by faith, with its quickening and all-regulative power—by undue exaltation of some remote, imperfectly revealed, or collateral notions, as, for example, about the Church, or the ministry, or ritual forms. These notions, with their connected observances, are more to them, than Christ apprehended by faith. Let us never be like them. But, seeing how wonderfully God interposed to deliver his Church from evils and perils, through which the gates of hell were threatening its overthrow, and how clearly he

has given us again the very heart of the gospel, and the whole gospel, let us cherish a sense of lively and ceaseless gratitude.

2. Again, as members of the Church of the Reformation, we should feel it our duty to preserve her true doctrinal and practical life. We need a revived interest in the great doctrine of justification by faith, as the central column of divine teaching in that Church of God which is the pillar of the truth. It is to be feared that with many this essential doctrine is not clearly apprehended, or rightly appreciated. It may be questioned whether it has its rightful prominence in the ministrations of the pulpit. If it was through the preaching of it, that God regenerated and reformed the Church, it is still, and forever, the great truth to be preached for the life of the Church and the salvation of men. And the faith meant in this justification, must be presented as no dead faith. The spiritual experiences through which God took Luther, and the work of power he made him do, are a divine protest against a religion of mere forms or dead dogmas. The idea of the need of personal piety, repentance, faith, thorough conversion, lies at the very roots of Lutheranism. Our Church rose in the very midst of a revival, and as the fruit of a revival. This glory God has given it. It would seem to be almost a specialty in the mission he has assigned it—to maintain this idea, with its reality, of a living Christianity, and carry it down the centuries in constant illustration. Let it be held fundamental in the character of our Church, as it is in the character of real Christianity.

ARTICLE II.

REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

LXXVIII.

JOHN HECK.

"How beautiful it is for man to die
Upon the walls of Zion, to be called,
Like a watch-worn and weary sentinel,
To put his armor off, and rest—in Heaven."

The life of a minister of the Gospel, in the ordinary discharge of his duties, although conspicuous, is not distinguished by many incidents. Often quiet and tranquil, unmarked by great vicissitudes or achievements, its story may be easily told, its narrative briefly given. It may have been, perhaps, the life of an obedient and loving child in the household, of a conscientious and diligent student at school, a devoted friend and a faithful pastor, a successful preacher of the Gospel, richer rather in human experience than in those eventful incidents, which so frequently characterize the career of men engaged in other pursuits. But he, nevertheless, deserves to live in the affections of the Church. The remembrance of his virtues will be as lasting, as it is blessed.

When we recall our recollections of the subject of the present sketch, we love to think, not so much of his eminence as a scholar, or of his great achievements and high reputation, as of his pure and beautiful life, his consistent and unsullied character, his influence and success in the great work, to which he had consecrated himself. He was truly a disciple whom Jesus loved. He had won his way to the hearts of all men. At College we loved and trusted him. Subsequently associated with him in various relations, we honored him for his faithfulness and integrity. When he passed away, so exalted a type of the man, the Christian and the minister, we could not but feel that we had sustained a personal bereavement; a shadow, more dark and lonely, seemed to fall upon the earth, since the counselor of our youth, and the friend of our maturer years had gone. The influence of his example, his cheering words and fraternal acts, will always be remembered. The light of his life will continue to shine upon our pathway, until the journey is ended. Very dear wast thou to us, dear brother! Thou hast gone before us, but we are following after, and pleasant as our intercourse was in the past, more pleasant still in the future will be the greetings beyond the River.

John Heck was born in Chambersburg, Pa., December 11th, 1809. Reared under religious influences, in early life he united with the Church under the ministry of Rev. Henry Moeller. For several years he was engaged in secular pursuits, but his mind having been deeply exercised on the subject of the Christian ministry and feeling it his duty to prepare for this field of usefulness, he aban-

doned his business and entered the Preparatory Department of Pennsylvania College at the commencement of the winter session of 1833, although in the twenty-fourth year of his age. Having successfully passed through the prescribed course he was graduated from College in 1839, the subject selected for him by the Faculty as his *Commencement exercise*, being the *Character of Christ*.

Mr. Heck's career, as a student, was very successful. He possessed rare industry, and maintained a high position in his class. His piety was sincere, simple and consistent. His Christian example was felt by the whole College community. He exerted an influence over his fellow students, such as is the privilege of few to exercise. His very presence, even when he kept silent, was an element of power, although he never hesitated to give utterance to his convictions when duty required it. Never could he be induced to sanction a measure of doubtful propriety. Professors and students alike had confidence in his Christian character. In his Literary Society, in the meeting for social prayer, in every relation he sustained, and every position he occupied, as Sabbath School teacher and superintendent, and Tract Distributer, as member of the Temperance Society and Manager of the Bible Society, you always knew where to find him; conscientious and faithful his motives were never impugned, his conduct never questioned. He was indefatigable in his efforts to do good. He seemed as anxious to find opportunities for usefulness as some are to avoid them. He loved the Lord's Day, the sanctuary, the communion of saints, the souls of men and the glory of God. After spending two years in professional study in the Theological Seminary, making in all a residence of eight years at Gettysburg, he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Maryland, at its session in 1841.

He commenced his ministry, as Pastor of the Newville charge, Cumberland Co., Pa., where he labored with success for three years. During his pastoral connection with this people, we spent a Sabbath with him and heard him preach a most earnest and pungent discourse from the words: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." The selection of the subject, the tones of his voice, the sincerity and earnestness of his manner, all indicated, that his heart was in the work, that he realized

the responsibility of his calling. We heard him, also, in German, and although we could not so readily follow him in this service, there seemed to be the same spirit, the same faithful devotion to his Master's business. It was on this occasion he remarked to us, that he did not regret he had spent so long a time at Gettysburg in the prosecution of his studies, although many of his friends, on account of his age, had advised him to abridge his course. "I believe," he added "my efficiency in the ministry has been greatly increased, and that with the blessing of God I can accomplish more in one year than I could, with superficial preparation in several years. Old as I am now, if I were to begin *de novo*, I would pursue the same course."

From Newville, Mr. Heck was transferred to the Waynesboro' pastorate, which he served with satisfaction for twelve years. In 1857 he received and accepted a call to Smithsburg, Md., where he continued till his death. A painful disease, the monitions of which he had for fifteen years felt, and which was, doubtless, aggravated by his necessary exposure, developed itself, a few months previous to his death, with a severity which compelled him to abandon his labors. But he was perfectly resigned. Firmly planted on the "Rock of Ages," and fully conscious of the security of his position, the closing scenes of his life were a realization of that promise, on which God has engaged to keep in perfect peace those, whose minds are stayed on him, a striking illustration of the faithfulness of our covenant-keeping Father, and of the peace and joy which crowns the Christian's life. "After the labors of twenty years in the ministry," he remarked, "I have reason to say, I am an unprofitable servant, but Christ is all and in all. The Gospel I have preached to others has been the guide of my life, and its consolations are the light of my death." His dying expressions were in perfect harmony with the general tenor of his life, ever exalting the infinite merits of Christ and hiding himself beneath the shadow of the cross. After an honored and useful life, radiant with truth and mellow with charity, with a character unsullied, and with nothing to dim the lustre of his name, in the full possession of his mental powers and the bright hope of a blessed immortality he finished his course, March 10th, 1861, and went to join the company of martyrs, confessors, and saints, in the rest, prepared for the people of God.

From all sections of the Church, among all who were brought in contact with the subject of our narrative, the testimony as to his personal worth and ministerial success is unequivocal and unanimous. "We never knew," says Dr. Anspach, "a man of purer motives, or more unblemished character. He was an honest man, and would have suffered martyrdom, before he would have varied an inch from the path of duty." He possessed, in an eminent degree, those elements of character, which secure for their possessor a powerful and a permanent influence. He was an able preacher, and no minister ever enjoyed more than he the confidence and affection of his people." Prof. W. F. Eyster, another classmate writes: "The marked characteristic of his life was *fidelity*. No considerations of personal advantage or ease, no fear of results could move him from a straight path, along which duty pointed. He was faithful to every engagement; persevering, laborious, diligent in the performance of every pastoral duty, reliable and punctual in the fulfilment of every promise." Dr. Krauth, also, a classmate says: "He was one of our most single-hearted, conscientious and faithful laborers. He gave himself, heart and soul, to his Master's work. We can gather not one memory to obscure the brightness of his Christian character. We loved him and we revered him, for with his kindness there was mingled a true Christian dignity. Christian love was in him the spring which in most men is supplied by ambition. Faithfully he bore its cross and performed its toils, and in eternal joy he now wears its crown."

From what has been presented, an impression of Mr. Heck's character may be easily formed. He was a laborious, faithful, fearless minister of the gospel. In every field, in which he was engaged, his devotion to his office was unremitted and effective; carefully watching over the interests of his flock, and concentrating upon himself the deep and abiding confidence of the whole community, his labors were richly blessed. He brought to the work a well balanced, fully disciplined mind. He had energy, strength of character, sound judgment, ripe experience, and large observation. The movements of his mind were calm, clear, sedate, and reliable. He was a man of eminent piety. It was not a mere impulse, but a settled, permeating, principle of life, carried into all the details of duty, and affecting his whole temper and conversation.

His preaching was thoroughly evangelical and instructive, with more of the practical than the doctrinal element; yet his power, as a preacher, lay not so much in what he said and thought, as in what he was. He was distinguished by his love of truth, his high sense of honor, and his freedom from all guile. He scorned a mean, dishonest action. He disdained cunning and intrigue, the adroit manipulation of men and of parties. He belonged to the class of men who think, and have the courage to speak and act as they think. "He acted openly," says Dr. Anspach, "without fear, or the hope of favor." He was self-reliant, firm in his convictions and unshaken in his resolutions. He was a man of positive opinions. He made up his mind without much regard to the views of others, and when he had come to a decision, he was not easily induced to swerve from it. He changed it only in obedience to strong reasons. He was, at all times, a zealous defender of his views, although he was tolerant towards those who differed from him. He was very decided in his political opinions, yet he was so sincere and honest, that no one thought less of him, no matter how strong his expressions of difference. He was faithful in his adherence to the religious faith in which he had been trained. But he had great charity for those whose theological views were at variance with his own, provided they held in sincerity and obeyed the cardinal truth, as it is in Jesus Christ. Doctrinal differences, such as are beyond the grasp of the human intellect, and which from the beginning have divided the Church, he considered of minor importance. He opposed fanaticism in religion, and manifested no sympathy with the extravagances, sometimes practiced in the churches. He was calm and intelligent in all his religious demonstrations. He was honored with many public and private trusts. He was a Trustee of Pennsylvania College, a Director of the Theological Seminary, frequently an Officer of Synod, and a Delegate to the General Synod, positions never sought by him, but conferred as a mark of confidence, as a testimony to his sterling worth, the duties of which he discharged with the most conscientious regard. In every relation of life, he always remembered his Christian calling and ministerial responsibility.

On the 2d of December, 1847, Mr. Heck was united in marriage to Annie Ziegler, of Leitersburg, who with five children survived him. Although he married late in life,

his habits were domestic. He loved the peaceful enjoyments of home and the society of his friends.

LXXIX.

MICHAEL DIEHL, D. D.

"It matters little what hour o' the day
The righteous fall asleep; death cannot come
To him untimely who is fit to die;
The less of the cold earth, the more of heaven;
The briefer life, the larger immortality."

On the 10th of April, 1869, Michael Diehl peacefully closed his earthly pilgrimage. He cheerfully resigned his spirit into his Saviour's hands. Although his voice is now silent among us, his brow is covered with heavenly glory, and he is among the stars with those who have turned many to righteousness. He occupies in his Father's house, a place in one of the mansions prepared for the blessed. He now rests from his labors, and his works do follow him.

The subject of the present sketch, was the son of Michael and Catharine Leininger Diehl, both natives of Lancaster County, and was born near Greencastle, Pa., February 12th, 1819. His childhood was characterized by a freedom from all vice, and exhibited that amiability of temper and goodness of disposition, which appeared, in so marked a degree, in mature life. In his intercourse, his conduct was kind and disinterested. He was willing to make any personal sacrifice for the comfort and happiness of others. He was never known to be angry. The foundation of his Christian character seems to have been laid at a very early period, the result, with the divine blessing, of faithful, religious instruction. His youth was imbued with a knowledge of the great truths of the gospel, and those truths became very early, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, the controlling principles of his life. He united with the Church in 1837, during the ministry of Rev. M. Harpel. He continued to labor on his father's farm until he commenced his classical studies, under the direction of Rev. F. A. M. Keller, who, for a brief period had charge of the Academy at Greencastle, and on the removal of his teacher to Waynesboro', he accompanied him as a pupil. Here he completed his preparation for College.

Mr. Diehl entered the Institution at Gettysburg, in 1841, with a mind matured and capable of appreciating the advantages which he enjoyed. We remember him well at this time. How faithful he was in the discharge of duty, how conscientious in his regard for College law, and how Christian in all his conduct! During the entire course he maintained his integrity. His influence was always in the right direction, for Christ and his Church. His mind was intent on the progress of religion, and every good cause had his ready sympathy and help. The College prayer-meeting, the Sabbath School, the Bible and Tract interests found in him a hearty and untiring advocate. During his connection with the Institution, in the winter of 1843, there was enjoyed a very precious season of divine grace. From the beginning of the term, there was much secret sighing, and fervent prayer to God for the outpouring of his Spirit upon the College, in answer to which, the young men seemed prepared to receive the truth, and it became the sword of the Spirit, quick and powerful. It took in nearly the whole College. The entire community of students appeared to realize, as they had never before, that they were in the immediate presence of Jehovah, that they must walk humbly and softly before him. Mr. Diehl's heart was alive with sympathy in this good work, and he rejoiced to see six of his classmates brought under its influence, with full purpose of heart surrendering themselves to the Lord, and uniting with the people of God in his service.

Mr. Diehl was graduated in 1844, during the administration of President Krauth. The subject assigned him by the Faculty, as his *Commencement* exercise, was the *Power of Faith*. He immediately, with much zeal, entered upon his Theological studies in the Seminary at Gettysburg. In the Spring of 1846, having received an earnest and importunate call to teach in Wittenberg College, an Institution recently organized under the auspices of the Lutheran Church, with Dr. Ezra Keller as its President, he agreed temporarily to accept the position, and, at once, transferred his home to Springfield, Ohio. He was, soon after, licensed to preach the gospel, and it was his earnest desire to enter upon the active duties of the pastoral work. But his services were regarded of so much value to the youthful College, that he was urged to continue them longer, although he still wanted to consider it only a tem-

porary arrangement. He was elected Professor of Ancient Languages in the Institution, but his heart was in the ministry. And, although he remained in his office as an instructor, until within a year of his death, he seemed to be in his element when engaged in preaching the gospel, or performing some pastoral labor. He generally had charge of congregations in the country, sometimes preaching as a supply, and always, when necessary, officiating in turn, on the Lord's Day, with his colleagues in the College Church. In consequence of impaired health and failing vision, his official connection with the Institution terminated in 1868. The Board of Directors, with reluctance accepted his resignation, and, in grateful recognition of his services and sincere appreciation of his abilities, conferred upon him the honorary degree of D. D.

His health continued to decline, but so gradually, that his death was sudden and unexpected to his friends. He was able to sit in his chair, until within an hour of his calm and peaceful departure. The last words he uttered were: "Raise me up, that I may testify for Jesus, my Saviour!" His sun went down in the serene beauty and tranquillity of a piety, which had illumined his whole Christian life. "Never before," says Dr. Sprecher, "did I when standing by the bed of death, feel so deeply, how desirable it would be for me, were it the will of God, to die, if mine could be just such a death as his."

The death of Professor Diehl created quite a sensation in the community. His remains were followed to the grave by a large concourse of people, and it may with great truth be said, that the whole surrounding country, as well as the Institution with which he had, for twenty-two years, been connected, mourned his departure. The solemn occasion was improved by an impressive discourse, delivered in the College Chapel by Rev. M. W. Hamma, the Pastor of the Church. The sad event was by all regarded as a public calamity. His colleagues in the Institution, in their resolutions of sorrow, "publicly testify that they have lost one of their loveliest associates," that "the College has been deprived of one of its best teachers, and the Church of one of its most devoted ministers." The *Miami Synod*, of which he had been so long an honored member, resolved, that by this bereavement "the cause of education has lost a most ardent friend, the Church, one of her most spiritual sons, and the world a good

man," and the *General Synod* deeply deplored the death of "a most faithful teacher, who had labored with special fidelity and success for the spiritual interests and improvement of the students" and that "the Church had been bereft of one of her most spiritual, zealous and beloved laborers."

Professor Diehl was married in 1851 to Harriet, daughter of Dr. Winwood, of Springfield, O. From this union there were four children, two of whom with their mother are still living to mourn their irreparable loss.

Few persons have been more universally esteemed than was Professor Diehl. His purity, integrity and childlike confidence shone forth in his intelligent face with perfect radiance. "He was not," says one* who knew him well, "intellectually great above others, but in goodness of heart, blamelessness of deportment, strength of Christian principle and devotion to the cause of the Master, he excelled most men, with whom I have been acquainted." Eminent for his private virtues, amiable in his disposition, affable in his address, gentle and unobtrusive in character, he attracted to him the hearts of all men; eminent for his deep spirituality he awakened the love, and secured the sympathies of all true Christians. Dr. Sprecher speaks of him as "one of the loveliest manifestations of human life." "Associated with him for twenty years in all the discussions, trials and labors of the Institution," he says, "I never heard from his lips one unkind word, or discovered in his acts one ungenerous principle." Dr. Conrad, also for some time, associated with him in the instruction of Wittenberg College, writes: "Discreet, genial and courteous, upright and consistent in all his conduct, he became a general favorite. He was endowed with natural and spiritual graces, so admirably blended, as to constitute him a Christian after the type of John, the beloved disciple."

Dr. Diehl was a man of earnest piety, of deep religious convictions and of strong religious attachments. He impressed all with the idea that he was a man of God, an example of intelligent, consistent and faithful devotion to the cause of the Redeemer. "His great characteristic" says Dr. Sprecher, "was his love of experimental religion." He loved the Saviour. He loved his fellow men. His naturally warm heart was wholly consecrated to the glory

* Rev. Dr. George Diehl, of Frederick, Md.

of God and the salvation of precious souls. The chief joy of his life was the advancement of genuine piety and the conversion of sinners. He loved to preach the gospel. Often for consecutive weeks and months, after the labors of the day in the recitation room, he would go into the country and preach to congregations during seasons of spiritual interest. During the winter of 1868, there was more than ordinary concern on the subject of religion in a small congregation, of which he had charge, several miles from his residence. For six weeks, every night, notwithstanding the inclemencies of the weather, he held services in his little church, so deeply interested was he in the progress of Christ's kingdom. He never seemed so happy, as when engaged in preaching the gospel and urging sinners to return to their Father's house, from which they had so ungratefully revolted. Repeated religious awakenings, and large accessions to the Church during his ministry, attested his fidelity and success in the work. It was his religious character that gave him so much power in the College. You always knew where to find him, when any Christian principle was involved. His views were clearly avowed and fearlessly maintained. Although naturally amiable and yielding in his disposition, he was firm and uncompromising in the support of what he thought was right. Most decided he was in all essentials, but gentle, unobtrusive and even diffident in all matters merely incidental. In the solemnity of his deportment and heavenly-mindedness, he very much resembled Dr. Ezra Keller.

Dr. Diehl was a man of clear intellect and sound judgment. But with the double duty of teaching and preaching, he did not find much time for special literary labor. He sometimes wrote for the Church papers, but the only work he ever published, was the "Biography of Ezra Keller, D. D., Founder and First President of Wittenberg College," issued in 1859. Perhaps, it was a mistake that he yielded permanently to the desires of those who wished to retain him in the Professor's chair, for the duties of which he had not any great enthusiasm, or special fondness. His mind was of a very practical character. For the pastoral work he was eminently fitted. He was adapted, beyond most men, to produce an impression on the people. This was his proper sphere. "He always," says

Dr. Conrad, "preached with general acceptance to his congregations, and with his time and energies devoted exclusively to the ministry, he would have made one of the most useful and popular Pastors in the Lutheran Church." He had a heart in sympathy with every truth he uttered, and in answer to prayer, he expected success from God, through the promised blessing of the Holy Spirit.

Such a man is a blessing to the ministry of the Church. The influence of his holy life must be felt in any community. It will continue to live and do good. God grant that such illustrations of the power of the gospel may be multiplied, until Christ shall dwell in all hearts by faith, that "they being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that they may be filled with all the fulness of God!"

ARTICLE III.

LUTHER ON THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF A. W. DIECKHOFF, D. D.*

By Rev. A. MARTIN, A. M. Professor in Pennsylvania College.

We purpose chiefly to show, in these citations, that our Church has Luther, in his later writings, in her favor, while, in her organization, she more and more decidedly rejects the erroneous theories which were linked, at first, with that great and important doctrine of the Reformation—the doctrine of the equal priesthood of all Christians. Of course, Luther never yielded a single point of the doc-

*The Translator thinks it but justice to himself, as well as to the author, to say, that in aiming to give, as near as possible, the real force of argument and course of thought in the original, and yet to make it readable English, he often found it necessary to sacrifice a strict literalness, and, in some instances, to leave out entire sentences.

trine of the universal Christian priesthood. That doctrine is identical with the very rights of the Christian faith itself, which were established in the Reformation.* The error which attached to the early doctrine of Luther on this point, consisted in his manner of conceiving the relation of the universal spiritual priesthood to the office of the Christian ministry, as it is ordained of God: namely, that he confounded the duties and functions of the ministerial office with those of the universal priesthood, and then beheld in the office the exercise of the functions and the discharge of the duties of the priesthood of all representatively in one, to whom these functions and duties were delegated by the rest. Just on this point Luther, in his later writings, differs from his earlier doctrine, and it is this, which it is of the utmost importance to observe.

It is not necessary to conceal the fact, that the separation from the former error, is not effected with perfect clearness and accuracy. A satisfactory development of the doctrine, in all directions, and from the true points of opposition, was not reached. We have here a phenomenon perfectly analogous to that of Luther's later relations to his earlier doctrine of predestination. The erroneous parts recede into the back-ground, and the opposite correct points of doctrine, in the most intimate connection with that which, from the beginning, was the very soul of Luther's work, occupy the foreground. Yet the significance and import of this circumstance is not weakened or diminished by these formal defects. Notwithstanding all irregularities and anomalies, nothing has ever appeared more clear, than the fact that Luther, in his later years assumed essentially a different position in regard to the relation of the spiritual priesthood to the ministerial office, as represented in his earlier teachings. Nor is it necessary that we should take, or elaborate, a complete statement of the doctrine of the office and its relations to the priesthood of Christians from the writings of Luther, either earlier or later. It is sufficient that we find the principles which the

* The blending of the Christian priesthood with the gospel ministry, is an error which Luther found to his hand in the Romish system, and, in his vindication of the equal priesthood of all Christians against the pretensions of the Romish clergy, it cannot really be claimed that he established, or sought to establish, the true gospel doctrine of the ministerial office.

Lutheran Church embodied in her organization, in her entire history, somewhere expressed by Luther, although the doctrine of the Lutheran Church is not necessarily one and the same thing with the doctrine of Luther.

The changed position of Luther to the error in his earlier doctrine of the priesthood of Christians, and of the office of the ministry, is especially seen in his pamphlet entitled: "*Von Schleichern und Winkelpredigern*."* Luther insists there most strongly, that only he who is regularly called and appointed, can be admitted to the sacred office: "Either show call and command to preach, or keep silent and cause to be silenced. For this is a matter of office—yea an office of preaching the word of God. But no man can have an office without commission and call."

To the "*corner-preachers*," who preach without "*commission*," he applies the word, Jer. 23 : 21: "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran. I have not spoken to them yet they prophesied." And Luther does not now, as in his early theory, establish the right of office upon the idea that, for the sake of order, the duties and functions which belong to each, but cannot be exercised by all, are delegated to one, in the name and in the place of all. He rather places himself in direct opposition to this theory, by his exposition of 1 Cor. 14 : 30; from which passage the "*corner-preachers*" derived the right for all to preach.

In order to have the full import of Luther's present exposition of this passage, it is necessary to consider, that Luther himself deduced his former theory, respecting the right of all Christians to preach—the "*ministerium verbi*"—from this very passage. But now he says: "Some, indeed, pretend that St. Paul, in 1 Cor. 14 : 30, gives to every one in the congregation authority to preach, and liberty even to bark against the regular preacher." Luther declares this a false interpretation of the text; and contends that St. Paul here speaks of the "*prophets that are called to teach*," and not of the congregation (*Pöbel*) who should listen. "But prophets," he says, "*are teachers who have the office of the ministry in the Church*. Let, therefore, these vagabonds (*Schleichern*) first show and prove, that they are prophets, and regularly called and commissioned teachers in the Church; and let them show who has appointed them to this office; and then let them be heard,

* Of vagabonds and corner-preachers.

according to St. Paul's doctrine." * * "These *corner-preachers* do not know what is meant in that passage by '*hearing*,' and what by '*preaching*'—what is a prophet and what a layman." * * "Let whoever will, read the entire chapter; and he will unmistakably find, that St. Paul there speaks of prophesying, teaching and preaching in the Church; *and does not command the congregation to preach*; but is dealing with the preachers who are appointed to preach in the congregation; else he could not forbid women to preach, who also belong to the Christian congregation."

And as it appears from the text it must have been in this wise, that the prophets and ministers and preachers sat among the people in the churches, and one or two read, or sang, the text, just as with us, in some churches on high festivals two are accustomed to sing the gospel responsively. On such text then one of the preachers or prophets present preached, and expounded it; when he had finished, another one of the preachers might make additional remarks."

Most decidedly does Luther now distinguish between the office of the ministry and the universal priesthood of Christians. He asks derisively, why these "*corner-preachers*" do not establish their rights upon the fact, that in the Old and New Testament women also prophesied. "Here they might plume themselves, and indeed give *women* authority and power to preach in the churches; and how much more therefore might the men preach and teach when and where they chose."

"And yet the Holy Spirit has ordained, through St. Paul, 1. Cor. 14 : 34. that women, notwithstanding they have the spiritual priesthood shall be silent in the churches. And although the apostle knew well, that the prophet Joel had foretold, that God would pour out of his spirit upon his '*hand-maidens*;' and he had himself even seen and heard the four daughters of Philip prophesy. Acts 21 : 9. But in the congregation and church women are to be silent. It is plain from the entire chapter, that the apostle here commands the congregation to *hear* and be *edified*, and not to preach." And Luther never justifies his own reformatory proceedings and all his official and public teaching and action by any reference to his spiritual priesthood, but always by reference to his office and calling.

In his exposition of the 110 Psalm *(A. D. 1539) Luther expresses himself still more decidedly if possible in regard to the relation between the priesthood of Christians and the office of the ministry. In this commentary Luther treats of the Christian priesthood, and while he endeavors to show that all Christians are priests, he distinguishes the office of the ministry from the priesthood of Christians, as something which does not belong to Christians as such, by virtue of their priesthood. He says; "Here distinction must be made between the office or service of bishops, clergymen and preachers, on the one hand, and on the other, the common ranks of Christians, (*dem gemeinen Christenstand.*) Clergymen and preachers are indeed in the ecclesiastical office; but they are not therefore *priests*, just as they are not, therefore, Christians." "It is indeed necessary that every one be first a Christian, a born *priest*, before he can become a preacher or bishop; and neither the pope nor any other mortal can make such a priest. But when one has been born a priest in Holy Baptism, then the office is added, and makes a distinction between him and other Christians." "For although we are all *priests*, it is neither possible nor proper that we should therefore all preach or teach and govern."

"But if you ask, wherein does the priesthood of Christians consist, and what are their priestly functions? Answer: '*teaching sacrifice and prayer.*'" Luther refers to his discussion of the universal priesthood; and we must observe that he specifies the duties of the ministerial office as "*preaching or teaching and governing,*" whereas the duties of the priesthood are, "*teaching, sacrifice and prayer.*" The difference of functions thus appears very clearly. And it cannot be objected, that "*teaching*" is one of the functions of the priesthood as well as of the office. For although "*teaching*" is one of the functions of the priesthood, Luther distinguishes very plainly the "*teaching*" of Christians, by virtue of their sacerdotal rights, from the regular public "*teaching,*" as it is the work of the ministerial office, of preaching and governing. Hear him:

"If we have become Christians through this High priest (Christ) and through this High priesthood, and we have in Baptism through faith been incorporated into him, we receive also power and authority to teach and

* Erl. Ed. vol. 40 pp 38 etc., cf. p. 168.

profess the word which we have from him, before all men, every one *in his calling and position*. For although we are not all in the public office and calling, yet every Christian may teach, instruct, exhort, comfort reprove his neighbor, with the word of God, as there may be necessity and occasion, as father and mother their children and household, one brother or neighbor or citizen or peasant, another." Then after having further treated of the priestly "*sacrifice and prayer*" of Christians, Luther concludes: "Behold every Christian has and exercises such functions of priesthood, *but over and above the same is the regular office which teaches in public, and this belongs to clergymen and preachers.*"

And in his sermons on chaps. 3 and 4 of the gospel of St. John, Luther now lays special stress upon the truth so inconsistent with his early *theory of delegation*, (*Uebertragungstheorie*), that it is God who *sends* pastors and teachers.* "John here speaks of the *divine sending*, which however is manifold. He speaks however especially of the *sending of the Son*: and treats of two kinds of *sending*: first, namely, that God sends his ambassadors (*Leute*) without means, as he sent the prophets and apostles, Moses and St. Paul, who were not called by men as through means, but without all means, sent by God, and have verbal command and commission directly from him. There never was any *sending* of this sort, except when God was about to begin something new, as through Moses and the prophets. In the New Testament he has discontinued *this sending*; for that of the apostles was the last. That is the high sending which is immediately from God. There is, indeed, another *sending*, which is also from God, but is accomplished through men and means, after the office is ordained by God, that there shall be preaching and the use of the keys. That then is to continue, and there will be no other ministry. But the same persons do not always abide; therefore provision must always be made for new preachers. And that cannot be done without means. The office, such as God's Word, Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is immediately from Christ. But afterwards there is another *sending*, which is through men, but not by men. Thus we are sent, and we again send others, and place them in the office, that they

* Erl. ed. vol. 47. p. 163.

preach and administer the sacraments. And indeed *this sending* also is from and by God. For God has commanded it, and by this, his command, *he himself sends laborers into his vineyard*; and yet he does it through men."

In his tract "*De conciliis et ecclesiis*" Luther recounts among the marks by which the church is known, such as the word, the sacraments, the keys, also the office of the ministry. "Fifthly is the church known by *consecrating* and calling ministers, or having offices and filling them. For there must be bishops, preachers and ministers, that shall give and administer the means of salvation, in the name and on account of the church—but much rather and chiefly *by virtue and on account of the institution of Christ*."* "Wherever now you see such offices and officers, you may know assuredly, that there is the church; for the church cannot be without such bishops, preachers, clergymen and ministers; and again they cannot be without the church, they must be both together."

Along side of the means of grace which God has given to the church, and whereby he begets its members, and builds it up, keeps and governs it, Luther places the office of the ministry. It occupies in his eyes, the position of service and instrumentality in the hands of Christ as his peculiar *institution* for dispensing the means of grace, and the "powers" of salvation, and for building and sustaining the church. In a sermon Luther says: "God could govern the world without judges or any offices of Government. So he could make the day without the sun—as in the first three days of the creation—but he has created sun and moon that they should rule the day and the night. So likewise the preacher is ordained to preach. God could indeed make people pious without preaching, but he has not seen fit to do so; but wishes to retain the office of the ministry, that the ministers might be his co-laborers, as teaches St. Paul. 1. Cor. 3 : 5. For a preacher is also called an angel of God, Mal. 2 : 7. just as David is called an angel in the scriptures, because he had the office of helping God to govern his people. God could rule the world without any of these offices, if he saw fit, but he has otherwise ordained."

Thus the ministry appears not as the office and service of the universal priesthood, whereby it accomplishes its

* Erl. ed. vol. 25, p. 364.

functions of worship, sacrifice and divine service before the Lord; but it is the institution, the ministry, the service of Christ, whereby he accomplishes his divine work in the Church.

In his tract, concerning the "*corner-mass*," Luther says again: "Finally, the office and the sacraments are not ours, but Christ's; for he himself has ordained them, to be used and practiced in his Church, to the end of the world."

* * "The holy Church teaches, therefore, that neither pope, priests, nor Christians, can make a single sacrament, not even the holy Christian Church. Our office is not to institute, nor change, but simply to give and administer. So a clergyman, or preacher, does not make the gospel; and by his preaching, the word does not become gospel; but by his preaching he offers and gives the gospel, which the Lord Jesus Christ has made, produced and left to us, and first impressed it on the hearts of his apostles, and ever since, through *their successors*, impresses the same upon the hearts of Christians."

In the most intimate connection with these thoughts, this also finds a prominent place in the later writings of Luther; namely, that there have always been, from the beginning until now, sent by God, first immediately, then mediately, ministers of Christ, in the Church, the apostles and their "*successors*" in ecclesiastical office. Never has the office in the Church, which was ordained and instituted by the Lord, which the Lord himself has "*made*," grown out of the congregation, as its product for the regular execution of its authorities and powers—"made" by the congregation—as if the Lord had immediately called the invisible Church into existence, and it then had become the creator and originator of the ecclesiastical office. As such an instance can avowedly not be shown, in the history of the Church, so such a view, which is, indeed, given in Luther's early theory, contradicts the clear fact of the origin of the office, and is equally inconsistent with the very nature of this office, as an office of Christ for the service of his work of salvation in the Church, both which facts are now made so prominent by Luther, and are so strongly insisted on.

By all this, the ministerial office is placed in a point of view in direct antagonism with Luther's former theories. The erroneous blending of the functions of the office with

those of the priesthood, which formerly found expression in the theory of *delegation of duties*, for the establishment of the office in the Church is removed; and the difference between both is brought out most forcibly. The functions of the office have to do with the work of Christ himself in the hearts of men, reconciling and renewing them, preserving and completing them in the new life, by which work of Christ men are made, and continue to be, priests—members of his priestly nation. This is the purpose and institution of the office, that Christ continues (although not immediately yet mediately) to preach upon the earth, and to spread his holy gospel, more and more, that he continues to communicate his gifts unto salvation and eternal life, and works mightily, by the Holy Ghost, in the means of grace, and continues to gather and create for himself a people in whom he reigns and officiates forever, as High Priest and King. For this purpose he has instituted the office of his word, and sent, without ceasing, the "*apostles and their successors*," and will continue to send them to the end of time. He will, indeed, take his ambassadors, and must take them, from the people of faith which he creates. The believers, in their works, serve him in his Saviour's work; but the offices, and the ministers in the offices, are ordained to functions in which his work of Saviour is executed in the Church. His preaching is continued in the preaching of the "*apostles and their successors*:" in their office they give, communicate and administer the means of grace created by himself—the Word, the Sacraments and power of the Keys; and in them he executes his communication of the eternal treasures and powers of grace which he has purchased for, and brought to, us. The office is not the product of the priestly nation, by which such priestly nation executes its functions and service before God; but it is from the Lord, who works and rules in his Church, as the Ever-Present One, and is ordained by him for his service in this, his work with man.

ARTICLE IV.

EXPOSITION OF LUKE 16:9.

By Rev. W. H. SETTLEMYER, A. M., Wilmore, Pa.

The complaint, of the Pharisees and scribes, that Jesus received sinners and ate with them, called forth four or five parables, illustrating what is the true fitness of persons and things; and vindicating his own conduct before them. Among these parables is that of the unjust steward; which is followed by a thought that associated itself in Christ's mind with the parable. This thought is clothed in the following peculiar language: "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

The main ideas attending the parable of the unjust steward, are: 1. The end or design he had in view; 2. The means of attaining that end; and 3. The reason or motive for so doing. If, therefore, the sequel of the parable represents the leading ideas of the parable itself—and this point is, in general, conceded—then we have, in the sequel, the same corresponding points. These points, in both cases, find their expression in the same original words.

Following the order given in the text, we have: 1. *The doing*, or the means of attaining the end in view, expressed by ποιῶ (v. 4), or ποιῶτε (v. 9); 2. *The reason*, or motive, *for so doing*, expressed by ἵνα ὅταν; 3. *The end in view*, expressed by δεῖναι μὲς, or δεῖναι ὑμᾶς.

I. *The means of attaining the end; or the "unrighteous mammon."* To determine the proper idea conveyed by the term "unrighteous mammon," it will be necessary first to find what is meant by the word "friends." For Christ exhorts his hearers to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. Is mammon, therefore, an instrument in our hands to make friends to ourselves of our fellow creatures, or are riches themselves to be the friends? The former view is advocated by Jacobus, Rosenmüller, Lange, Bengel and Alford. Wolf makes the apostles and evan-

gelists to be the friends. Ambrosius, Ewald, and Meyer, suppose them to be the angels. Morris and Smith state that "by friends here, we are not to understand any particular persons or things. It is equivalent to the phrase "*securing happiness.*"

It is impossible, within our allotted compass, to review all these opinions, but the reason why we do not believe that it has a reference to our fellow creatures—which is the most plausible of the given views—is, because the system, or plan, of making true friends, by means of money, is unphilosophical, whether regarded from a psychological, or practical point of view. Friends, in the proper sense of that term, are not made by the instrumentality of physical resources; even when these resources are considered in the light of their commendable qualities, much less are riches the means of making true friends, when considered in relation to their uncertainty and deceitfulness. The rewards of such instrumentality, result in nothing more than to attract a host of moths about a brilliant light. The heathen philosopher, Cicero, understood better than to put the basis of friendship on money, for he distinctly declares that "there can be no friendship but between the good." "*Amicitia, nisi inter bonos, esse non potest.*" So Christian congeniality, a term embracing everything pleasant, attractive and true, must be the true instrumentality of Christian friendship. It is well known that true friendship is not at all dependent on money; and if such a signification is attached to these words, it makes Christ the author of an unphilosophical and untenable maxim. It is equally well known, on the other hand, that pecuniary resources are, in themselves, a blessing or a curse. Riches, then, rightly appropriated, may, in a figure, be called friends, for friends are at all times blessings. The unjust steward did not care so much for the friends personally considered, as for friends considered in a pecuniary point of view. The real friends which he had in view, were the means of livelihood; the ostensible friends were the persons in possession of the needed resources. This project of the steward was commended; therefore, it is not inappropriate to regard available resources, in this case also, as friends. This will become apparent in the consideration of the last clause, "that they may receive you," &c.

This position, that one cannot make friends with money, will be seen, upon a little reflection, to be valid, whether

mammon is regarded as certain, i. e., true to its sphere, or uncertain; reliable, or deceitful. But as *adikia* has a bearing on the context, as well as on the word which it qualifies, it will, in itself, require some investigation.

Mammon itself, the Syriac word for riches, as used in the New Testament, implies a doubt concerning the appropriate use of those riches to which it is applied. But when the *unrighteous* mammon—the unjust (*injustitiæ*—*Montanus*) the iniquitous (*iniquitatis*—*Vulgate*) that which is the fruit of fraud, oppression and plunder, for this is implied in the ordinary signification of *adikia*—is to be made the object of friendship, then is there reason to doubt whether the *usus loquendi* of *adikia* should, in this case, be employed. Among commentators, *μαμωνα της αδικιας* is, for the most part, explained as unstable, fleeting, deceiving riches. This view is set forth by men, accredited for learning, but, unfortunately, without support. Nor, on the other hand, can such men as Olshausen, Lange, or Alford, be said to be *opposed* to this view, but they do not by any means accord with it. But, leaving the opinions of men, can it be substantiated by argumentation that *adikia* has, in this case, any reference to delusive or deceitful riches? I think not. However I do not intend to argue that riches are not uncertain, *αδηροτης*, as they are called in 1. Tim. 6 : 17, which reads; "Charge them which are rich in this world not to trust in the uncertainty of riches," but that *adikia* does not signify uncertain or deceitful: 1. Because in the sixty two times that it is used, either in the form of a noun, verb, adjective, or adverb, in the New Testament exclusive of the three times used in this connexion, it bears no such signification. 2. Because classic lexicographers attach no such definition to the word. 3. Because there is no condition connected with this passage, or the context, that demands such an explanation. On the contrary, riches are regarded, in the context, as true to their sphere, honorable, and worthy to be made an object of duty. Then if *adikia* does not signify unstable or deceptive, are we to make friends with what is worse—the *unrighteous*, or ill-gotten mammon? No. We do not take *adikia* to mean *unrighteous*, or fraudulent, but *less* righteous. It is true that we have not the ordinary New Testament use of the word to warrant us in this—nor the classical use, but philosophy, or more aptly, the common sense and experience of men, which finds its ratification

in the scriptures, favor it, as well as analogous scripture passages, and the context.

1. To the common sense and experience of men, there is no need of proof that wealth, properly accumulated and employed, is as a friend to us in this world. Though fraudulent gains are in no case to be employed for our sustenance, yet it is also taught that a corban is not well-pleasing to God when a father is in want; and that if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he has denied the faith. If therefore wealth has its sphere, which contributes to the true comfort and pleasure of men, its commendation by Christ must refer to that sphere. Wealth is never represented as uncertain or deceitful, except when our hopes for soul-happiness is founded thereon. It moreover reflects on the goodness of God to regard his gifts otherwise than good, and true to their design.

2. As for the analogous use of terms, *i. e.* antithetical language used tropically for comparative, it is only necessary to refer to Christ's own use of *μισοι τον πατερα*. (Luke 14 : 26) for *φιλον πατερα* * * * *υπερ ημι*. (Matt. 10 : 37.) "If any one come to me and *hate* not his father," &c., for, "he that loveth father * * * *more than me*." This analogy might be deemed sufficient, but a few more examples will better illustrate this idiom, which obtained place in oriental modes of thought.

It is said that Jacob loved Rachel *more than* Leah, (Gen. 29 : 30—31,) but in the verse immediately following God saw that Leah was hated.

Again, He that spareth his rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes. (Prov. 13 : 24.) The rod is not usually *spared* under the plea of *hatred*, but of *love*. That less parental instinct, which regards the present feelings of the child, controls the parent, instead of that nobler purpose which regards its future, as well as its present welfare.

It is moreover said, that he that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it, &c. (Jno. 12 : 25.) Is this life here spoken of the personal self—the *ego*? then does Christ also say: "Love thy neighbor as *thyself*." (Mat. 19 : 19.) Self is therefore not to be absolutely ignored, but it is not to be made the supreme object of our affection. Thus the same sense of hating is here unfolded as above.

The case of Esau and Jacob can easily be shown to imply a similar use of terms. (Rom. 9 : 13.) This is seen by (1.) The recognition of the rights of Edom when opposed to the chosen people of Israel—even when they defied Israel they escaped without a rebuke from God. (Num. 20 : 14—21.) (2.) The Lord's prohibition to Israel to meddle with Edom. (Deut. 2 : 4—5.) (3.) The similarity of God's Providence over them, and the continued recognition of their brotherhood. (Josh. 24 : 4. and Deut. 4 : 5.) (4.) Esau's receiving the blessing of faith concerning things to come. (Heb. 11 : 20. and Gen. 27 : 39.) God does not bless what he absolutely hates—therefore Esau was only less loved.

3. It was also said that the context favors this view. (1) The verse following, which bears directly on the passage under consideration, informs us, that he that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much, &c. The marginal notes refer the explanation of this verse to the parable of the talents in Matt. and the parable of the pounds in Luke, and rightly, for the results, or rewards, are the same. In these parables much was represented as given, because faithfulness was shown in that which was little. Then what the "least" and the "much" signify is not difficult to determine, viz., temporal and spiritual interests. Faithfulness in the one is the pledge of faithfulness in the other. Having now determined the sense of the 10th verse, let us follow on to the next. If therefore—i. e. if he that is faithful in the least &c.,—if therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon—i. e. that which is least, or less valuable, who will commit to your trust the true. Here we have the unrighteous mammon clearly put in apposition with that which is "least," or least valuable; and the least is clearly representative of temporal goods, as shown above. These two verses expose the 9th verse quite clearly; but the 12th throws another light on it. And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's who shall give you that which is your own? That which is the least, and that which is the unrighteous mammon, is here represented as that which is another's. To represent riches as belonging to another is in perfect harmony with other portions of the scriptures; for we are the stewards of God's gifts, (Ecc. 3 : 13. and 5 : 19,) wherein we are commanded not to be slothful, (Rom. 12 : 11,) lest the Lord

take away what he has given into our hands. (Mat. 25 : 28. Job. 1 : 31.) But the true (inheritance) is not given to us as stewards, for the servant abideth not in the house forever, but as heirs, even joint heirs with Christ, and will never be taken from us—therefore it is quite appropriate to say that they are *our own*. In this you observe the contrast beautifully set forth between temporal good, and spiritual.

2. Another reason from the context, why the *unrighteous mammon* may be regarded as only the *less* righteous, is from the antithesis of terms. The true antithetic term for *adikia*, is *dixē*, but here we have *αληθης*—*a* and *αληθ*, that which cannot be forgotten, or cast into oblivion, real, enduring, abiding forever, and therefore of *greater* value, in contrast with that which shall pass away, as earth and sky. This fact suggests, by virtue of the attending circumstances, as well as by the words set in contrast, the idea of temporal good, or that which is *less* valuable, as riches, without reference to their delusiveness as such, or to those that are ill-gotten, but rather with a reference to their typical relation to the true riches; for faithfulness in the one is regarded as a high recommendation for faithfulness in the other.

When, therefore, this idea is connected with the interpretation of *adikia*, it relieves the whole passage from further difficulty, and renders the exposition otherwise natural and easy. This view, viz., that the unrighteous mammon signifies ordinary temporal resources, has also been shown to have more substantial basis than that which assumes the idea of *deceptive* riches, and therefore claims the preference.

II. The second proposition—the motive for making to ourselves friends—will find sufficient explanation in the following one, and need not, for that reason, consume further space.

III. The end in view—*ἵνα * * * δεξωται ἑμὲς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους ἀγαθὰς*. The first question that arises here, is, who, or what is meant to be the subject of *δεξωται*? In answer to this Lange says: "The friends acquired with our money." So Bengel, Doddridge, and others. Rosenmüller makes it "a Hebraism, by which the third person of verbs is used impersonally. It is God who receives us into this everlasting habitation."

These answers are very unsatisfactory, and why they

are so, will be seen by observing some answers, given to another question. How can your friends, that have been made by money, receive you?

Bengel says that "Liberality alone is not sufficient, but yet this removes a great impediment (*grande impedimentum*) in the way of entrance into the everlasting habitations." Here Bengel assumes that more than liberality is necessary, while the text makes the mammon itself sufficient to gain an entrance into these habitations. To say, on the contrary, that liberality removes a great impediment in the entrance to heaven, and steer clear of work-righteousness, is certainly no less difficult of execution than to gain a passage between the Scylla and Charybdis. Jacobus says: "This is the provision which is to be made by the Christian, in things temporal." Provision for what? For an entrance into heaven? Then the sacrifice on Calvary is inadequate! Then Christ is not sufficient! Morris and Smith say: "Employ your money in such a way, that when you are discharged from life, you may be received into *eternal mansions* in heaven." But how can the proper employment of money obtain for us an entrance, unless, indeed, our works are acknowledged as meritorious?

For these reasons are we dissatisfied with the answers to the first question; for there is no expedient, by which we can avoid work-righteousness, in case the money, or the friends acquired with the money, are made to receive us, or to be instrumental through the prime agency of money in obtaining for us a reception into heaven. To understand God as the subject of *δεξασθαι*, breaks the grammatical connection, besides being otherwise quite objectionable.

The act of making friends of mammon, which is the only given condition of entrance into the habitations spoken of, and the salvation of the soul, have no possible logical connection—i. e., as a certain sequence unquestionably resulting from a given condition, as the text demands, unless, indeed, by our own actions we are enabled to purchase—papist-like—our tickets for the portals of bliss. No exegete, or logician, on Scripture grounds, can make salvation issue as a legitimate sequence from the best possible use of money, *per se*. If these answers are unsatisfactory, to which unsatisfactoriness all will readily assent, how can the question be solved? Simply by following

the natural and grammatical construction of the language. The subject of *δεξονται* is a pronoun understood, and refers to *φίλους* as its antecedent. These friends we have shown to be temporal blessings, in the form of pecuniary resources. But how are *pecuniary resources* to gain for us an entrance into *τας αἰωνίους σκηνάς*? The question has been made difficult, because two ideas have been assumed that are utterly at variance with each other. The one, that friends are to be made of, or with, mammon; the other, that heaven was to be the result. Whatsoever view of mammon you may desire to take, whether it is regarded as sure, or deceitful, it cannot, as the *primal and substantial cause*, *per se*, effect any such result. That it is represented as the primal and efficient agent, *per se*, for effecting an entrance into *τας αἰωνίους σκηνάς*,—whether directly by its own means, or more indirectly through the medium of some personal instrumentality—no one will deny. Then, for reasons already given, it is impossible that *τας αἰωνίους σκηνάς* should refer to heaven. *Σκηνή* is a tent, or tabernacle, designed for shelter and comfort. *Αἰώνιος* means everlasting, but, when applied to finite substances, is limited in duration, and “sometimes means *during life*.” Euripides uses it in this wise (Alcest. 337). *Ἀλλ’ ἴς τ’ ἂν αἶων οἶμος ἀρτιζῇ*. “As long as my life holds out.” To say, then, that *τας αἰωνίους σκηνάς* may mean “life-long habitations,” is only to give it a perfectly natural and legitimate signification. This, we think, is the real and designed intent of this sequel, or conclusion to the injunction in the former part of the verse. 1. Because the words expressing the three main points of the unjust steward’s resolution, the design of which was commended, are the same as those which characterized Christ’s injunction, viz., the doing—the reason for it—and the design. The steward made provision for the days of temporal want; this, then, we infer, is also the design of Christ’s admonition. 2. Because it is in harmony with the context. To be faithful in securing comforts for declining life, is a pledge of faithfulness in securing the true comforts of a coming, though endless, future. 3. Because it frees every other part of the passage from every conceivable difficulty, save the figurative use of *ἀδίκια*, which we have shown consistent with Christ’s design and use of metaphors. 4. It is altogether conformable to the analogy of faith. 5. Because it is the only logical and natural result flowing from the proper use

of money. 6. Because *αἱ* with the accusative demands that mammon should be a competent means for the transferring its possessor from one state, or condition, *into* another; and not simply receiving them *in* another, as some explain it. But mammon has no power to make friends of any kind that shall be capable of receiving us *into* heaven; wherefore it is evident that *αἱ* must have reference to earthly tabernacles. 7. Every other view is attended with insuperable difficulties. Therefore we conclude that *εἰς αἰώνιος αἱ* should be translated "*life-long habitations.*"

There is yet a word in the midst of this verse, expressing the time of entrance into these habitations, which has caused commentators some trouble—*ἐκλείπει*. There has been some doubt in reference to this word, both as to its form and signification. In regard to form, it is now very well agreed that the *textus receptus* is the better reading; but in regard to signification, it is not so clear to some expositors that its use, in this place, has any reference to death. This word is used in but two other places in the New Testament. Once it refers to faith as failing; and once to failing years. *Εκλείπει* does not, in general, signify "to die," as many translate it, but has its sense admirably expressed in our version, when "*ye fail.*" To "fail" is a very significant and common expression among us at the present day, and well expresses the enfeebled condition of old age—the age in which one cannot sustain himself, or find comfort, unless he has made to himself friends of the unrighteous mammon. Classical usage also fully endorses this sense of the word. Among the definitions given, are such as these: "To fail," "to be wanting," "to be deficient," "to faint." In the passive, where the word here used is found, it bears the ordinary signification of being abandoned or forsaken. Similar illustrations are even found in the active, *e. g.*, *ψυχὴ ἀλλοίωθ' ἐὰν οὕτω πάντα ἀλλοίωκε* *με*: "Life or energy has forsaken the bones, and all things have left me." The rendering of this word in our authorized English version, is, therefore, a happy one, and expresses to our ears just precisely what the context requires, and what the original word, in itself, is naturally designed to convey.

Having separately and critically examined the alleged points of difficulty, let us now combine these points of fragmentary criticism, and sum up the whole by paraphras-

ing the text, which, in modern phraseology, may be expressed in this wise: Gain for yourselves the blessings flowing from the proper accumulation and use of temporal and pecuniary resources, that when you become enfeebled, they may be to you a source of sustentation and comfort. Or more briefly and literally, make to yourselves friends of temporal resources, that, when ye fail, they may receive you into life-long habitations.

This view may not commend itself on the ground that Christ does not teach for this world; but a reference to Mat. 3: will dissolve these clouds.

It may also be regarded by some as unique, but it has the sanction of economy, the authority of experimental wisdom, the warrant of reason, the support of analogy, and the consistency of truth.

ARTICLE V.

THE IDEALISM OF BERKELEY, AS SET FORTH IN THE THREE DIALOGUES BETWEEN HYLAS AND PHILONOUS.

Among the self-confident Materialists of the reign of George I. the Idealism of Berkely fell like a philosophical bomb-shell and, though its explosion injured not their portly bodies, it addled their dry heads in a manner most perplexing. It was introduced, too, at a most auspicious time, for, like the old Athenian who was tired of hearing Aristides called the Just, the world was weary of the old song of Materialism, and hailed with delight the new Philosophy which bade fair to make Materialism and its disciples, too, the most airy sort of ideas imaginable. As a second favorable circumstance, the new system had been matured in sublime simplicity and beauty by a master-mind, by a learned, pious and merry Bishop, who was either ignorant of the results which in the future should disgrace but perfect the system in the hands of Hegel, Schelling and Fichte, or who, in event of finding no possible retreat from this position, planted his God, *Terminus* in

what was still solid earth, at a safe distance from the philosophical precipice which ends in Infidelity.

Although in the "beautiful woof of a philosophical brain and in trains of purely abstract thought, all his Idealism may seem an inconstructible reality, yet, when lowered from this lofty sphere to the baser earth and practice, it seems the purest sophistry. David Hume said of it: "No man can believe it, no man can refute it." Now I cannot believe and therefore, if in my hardy endeavors to do it battle, I should display but my own weakness, may the authority of the great Scotchman cover up my shame.

The question is one of great importance and charming interest, and demands a deeper consideration than the argument of the wit implies, who said, that: "If there were no such thing as matter, it was no matter what Berkeley said:" and Dr. Johnson's stubbed toe will do more damage to his own and his disciples feet than to the accomplished trotter in the bogs of metaphysics.

In this paper I propose only a short review of Berkeley's doctrines, as stated in his three dialogues between Hylas and Philonous. These dialogues are distinguished as well for their beauty as for their success in vindicating the doctrines of Idealism and, being almost his last publication on the subject, should be supposed to contain his latest and most matured views. They profess to prove:

I. That nothing sensible exists without the mind, that neither the primary nor secondary qualities can exist unperceived.

II. That there could not possibly be such a thing as a substratum of material phenomena.

III. That our ideas could not possibly represent material objects.

The proof of the first two of these propositions would be a complete demonstration of the non-existence of matter and confirmation of Idealism. The third, though indirectly, a blow at the existence of matter, is chiefly valuable because it shows us his real belief on certain doctrines, with regard to which, I believe, he has been misconceived. I hope to show that Berkeley has not established himself in these three positions

In order to make his argument more tangible, I have reduced the whole in a series of syllogisms expressed gen-

erally in his own words. These form the foundation stones of his doctrine and the more one can tear away, the weaker will his edifice be. To this end I shall consider each separately.

Again in reading such works we are apt to confine ourselves to the principles and illustrations given by the author; whereas a more extended application might demonstrate their weakness by their absurdity. Among others there are certain fundamental principles and axioms in the breast of every religious and of almost every thoughtful man, which are to him, through faith or instinct, self-evident, and anything that is repugnant to these by that very fact proves itself false. This will form the second ground of examination.

The first step of Berkeley's argument,

1. To prove that nothing sensible exists without the mind.

Sensible things only such as are immediately perceived by the senses.

Take away all sensible qualities and there remains nothing sensible,

But sensible qualities exist only in the mind.

Therefore, nothing sensible exists without the mind.

In the first place, logically considered, Berkeley has begged the question; he has assumed in his minor premise what he proposed to prove. This is an unpardonable error and invalidates the conclusion.

But, supposing, the argument to be logically legitimate, I think that the falsity of one premise—that nothing sensible exists without the mind—is apparent. A sensible quality is a quality that can be perceived, but it seems absurd to say that it cannot exist, except when perceived.

While I admit that the perception of a sensible quality can exist in the mind alone, I deny that a sensible quality cannot exist without the mind, or unperceived. For all the organs of perception are in man, whereas all things perceivable are in matter; therefore, though all the organs of perception were swept from the earth, it does not follow that all things perceivable would go too. I might, by a few changes, make this syllogism just as strong for Materialism, as it seems for Idealism.

To prove that *everything* sensible exists without the mind.

Take away everything sensible, and there remain no sensible qualities.

But everything sensible exists without the mind.

Therefore, no sensible qualities exist in the mind.

Now this syllogism, though as strong as the first, is open to exactly the same objections.

2. To prove that the secondary qualities exist only in the mind.

Heat is a sensible quality.

Great heat is painful—little heat is pleasant.

But neither pleasure, nor pain can exist in an unperceiving substance as matter.

Therefore, great or little heat cannot exist in material bodies.

This would look to an eye more experienced in pursuing the practical than in hunting a theory through the mazes of the brain, uncommonly like sophistry. All that Berkeley has proved here is, that the perception of pleasure and pain cannot exist in an unperceiving substance as matter. And again he has defined heat by one of its contingencies and then substituted the contingency for the thing itself—thus making a part equal the whole. Great heat is not only painful, but it is also a reducing agent, and it would be just as fair to substitute this attribute in the syllogism, and make the argument *materially* different.

Heat is a sensible quality.

Great heat is a reducing agent.

But a reducing agent cannot exist in an unextended substance as the mind.

Therefore, great heat cannot exist in the mind.

Now here, I commit the same error as Berkeley in forcing matter into the province of mind in the same grossly inconsistent way he forces mind into the province of matter.

He uses exactly the same form of argument against the ordinary secondary qualities as against heat, *e. g.*, against taste. A sweet taste is a kind of pleasure; sugar has a sweet taste, but pleasure cannot exist in a material substance like sugar.

Every quality gets its name only by its relation to our senses: if we had no sense corresponding to it, the quality would be to us unknown and unthought of. We can readily conceive that there may be qualities, not corresponding to any organ of perception in us, and therefore, to us as zero. On the very same ground, since we deny all organs of per-

ception to matter, we can understand a quality painful to us existing in it, unperceived, because it has no faculty of pain.

To prove the impossibility of any quality inhering in matter he says: "Suppose now one of your hands hot and the other, cold, and that they both, at once, are put into the same vessel of water in an intermediate state; will not the water seem cold to one hand and hot to the other?" Now that the water should be hot and cold at the same time, he goes on to say, is a manifest absurdity and since no true principles lead to an absurdity these principles must be false. Now the real difference of temperature is stated to be in the hands, and then transferred to the water. Every quality is named and estimated in relation to our senses. Here the sense of feeling in one hand was different from that in the other, hence the same body, applied to each, ought to have a different effect. To the hot hand the water seems cool, to the cold hand it seems warm—the difference manifestly lies not in the sensible thing, but in the sensation of the sensible thing by senses under different circumstances. In short, the difference lies in the senses themselves. The wise Berkeley in this example makes himself the very brother of the ancient fool who observed, with astonishment, a man blowing upon his porridge to make it cold, and his fingers to make them warm. But the ancient observer was not an Idealist and, little suspecting the theories that could be founded on this culinary phenomenon, concluded, to put no trust in a man who could deal so doubly. Berkeley sees a similar phenomenon, and finding water, to seem both hot and cold, immediately concludes that there can be no such thing as water. The fool, however, can justly claim the priority of observation.

The same strictures are applicable to his treatment of the other secondary qualities.

Arguments to subvert the real existence of the primary qualities in matter.

3. Against figure and extension.

A pebble appears to our eye very smooth, small and regular.

To a mite it would seem rough, large and irregular.

Its qualities are, therefore, changed.

But no quality, inherent in any object, can be changed, without the object itself be changed.

Now how does Bishop Berkeley know that the pebble would seem rough, large, and irregular, to a mite? It is a mere logical deduction which proves no change in the pebble, but simply the difference between a man and a mite, which might have been done at much less length. Because a mountain, 600,000 times as big as a man, would appear rough, large and irregular to him, he supposes and, justly too, that a pebble 600,000 times larger than a mite would appear correspondingly rough, large, and irregular to it. But this proves only what we would naturally expect, that the difference lies in the perceptive organs of the man and mite. As in a former illustration the difference lay, not in a single basin of water, so that it should be hot and cold at once, but in a difference of sensation in two hands. For all our ideas and conceptions are relative to ourselves, our senses, and our associations, so that we are forced to suppose rather, that the comparative size and organs of the man, as compared with those of the mite, made the difference, than that a single stone was two different things at the same time. Just as an inhabitant of a level plain, if suddenly transported to the smallest mountain in Switzerland, would think it large and grand; while the chamois hunter whose mind from youth had been expanded by far greater and grander scenes, would consider it but little worthy of such wonder and admiration. This difference is one rather of opinion than fact, one which we naturally ascribe to the associations of the two men, and not like Berkeley to a real difference in the hill itself.

4. Against motion.

Time is measured by the succession of ideas in the mind. A's ideas may succeed each other three times as fast as B's. Now a wheel, which would go three miles an hour to A's mind, would go only one mile an hour to B's. Therefore, it is moving both fast and slow, which is impossible. This is a very good definition of time as estimated relatively to each man's mind, but time absolute is measured by the revolutions of the heavenly bodies.—Berkeley derives a certain conclusion from time as understood in the first definition and applies it to time as understood in the second. Assuming that time be measured by the succession of our ideas, and that the succession of ideas in A's mind that correspond to an astronomical hour is three times as great as the succession of ideas in B's

mind in an astronomical hour, then as far as time goes one-third A equals one B. Now here the astronomical unit of time, the hour, remains unchanged and absolute throughout, and the only thing established is what was assumed that A's ideas move three times as fast as B's, and not that one hour equals three. What was already assumed in his premises, I say, state explicitly that the difference lies in A's mind as compared with B's, and yet in his conclusion he contradicts his first statement and attempts to fix the difference on the single wheel by proving that the wheel is doing two diametrically opposite things at the same time, which would be annihilation.

But the syllogism does not justify such a conclusion, its whole import being that A's ideas move three times as fast as B's. The wheel, indeed, though moving absolutely according to our fixed unit of time two miles an hour, may relatively to our ideas move fast or slow without inconsistency, as when a man hurries to the bed-side of a dying friend, his ideas move so quickly and are withal so deeply impressed upon his mind, that the fastest vehicle which can bring him to his journey's end seems cruelly slow to him. Or again four hours may pass in pursuits of pleasure and seem but two to us. This brings me again to the principle already stated, that every quality possesses a degree of intensity or estimation relative to the temporary state of permanent character of each man's senses. To the feverish man an amount of heat is painful, which in his natural state would be agreeable. In disproving these primary qualities, he says he has disproved all the rest, and gives them no more attention.

The necessary existence of matter, as a substratum of the qualities we perceive, seems its last stronghold and to storm it the Bishop marches with flying colors.

5. A substratum is something which is spread under the qualities of an object to support them.

Its nature must be different from the qualities it supports; *e. g.* it is spread under extension but its own nature must be different and distinct from extension.

Therefore, it is spread without extension, which is impossible.

We have shown that sensible qualities, Idealism to the contrary notwithstanding, can exist in material bodies. It is the intuitive belief of our nature, the testimony of

our consciousness, that they do. The authority which Berkeley thinks sufficient to establish his own existence he ignores, when it testifies the existence of matter. A quality or phenomenon of matter as well as of mind must be a quality or phenomenon of something, in which something it inheres. This has led philosophers to assume the necessary existence of a material substratum, in which material phenomena inhere. That we do not entirely understand, and cannot accurately explain this bond of union, which is beyond all experience and above demonstration, should not be considered an argument against its existence. On the contrary, the grounds upon which we assume its existence are like the grounds upon which we assume the existence of a God. Certain effects are seen which demand a cause and we supply a cause, whose nature we can never hope to grasp, or aspire to conceive.

In his argument on this point Berkeley has diverged not a whit from his customary sophistry. That which should be really regarded as just as intangible as the mind itself, he grossly supposes to be *spread under*. As well might we say the mind is an *unextended*, indivisible, spiritual, substance and in it inheres an infinity of phenomena, but without extension, it cannot support or contain anything. This would be a grossly literal and unphilosophical way of treating such a subject. And he points out its impropriety when applied to the mind, but employs it with stranger inconsistency against matter. If there be no substratum of mental phenomena, then we are but a succession of ideas, governed by certain laws of combination and sequence. Here mind and matter are both done away with, and we arrive at the pure Idealism of Hegel. But granting that no such substratum as matter can exist, then these phenomena must inhere in the substratum-mind. Under these circumstances the great barrier between the microcosm and the macrocosm is broken down. All I see without me, the universe and all its wonders, are as much my mind as that unperceivable subtle spirit within me, which I think eternal and immortal. The thoughts and ideas of one part of my mind I am only conscious of, but those of the other I can see, feel, and taste. To taste an idea seems curious but I may well believe it, since Berkeley shows me that God has filled this beautiful earth for generations with races whose eyes were blinded and whose strongest beliefs were but infatuation.

6. To prove that since Ideas exist in the mind alone, they cannot represent material objects.

Material objects are perceived by sense.

They must be immediately perceived.

Therefore, they cannot be perceived through the medium of ideas.

7. To prove the same.

If our ideas are representatives of external objects, they must be like them.

External objects have a stable and independent nature.

But our ideas are ever-fleeting and variable.

Therefore, they cannot be like them, and consequently cannot represent them.

These two arguments are employed to show the error of Hylas in trying to reconcile the existence of the external world thus: "I think there are two kinds of objects, the one perceived immediately which are likewise called ideas; the others are real things or external objects perceived by the mediation of ideas, which are their images and representations. Now I own ideas do not exist without the mind, but the latter sort of objects do." Yet a philosopher as great as Hamilton, entirely misconceiving Berkeley's opinion on this point, has classed him among the philosophers who believe in the theory which he here attacks. To substantiate this assertion, let me quote a few more passages from his works.

In his principles of human knowledge Art. LXXXVII, when speaking of our sensations he says: "But if they are looked on as notes or images referred to things or archetypes existing without the mind, then we are involved all in scepticism. We see only the appearance and not the real qualities and things."

"I am not for changing things into ideas, but rather ideas into things: since those immediate objects of perception, which according to you are only appearances of things I take to be the real things themselves."

These are arguments directly against that school of philosophers, who, while believing in the existence of material objects, supposed that we never perceived them directly, but through the medium of ideal representations. They are indirect blows against any possible existence of matter for, having proved before that we do not perceive it, he now adds that we do not even perceive its representation.

A few general remarks upon Berkeley's doctrines will conclude this paper. He classified existence into spirits and ideas. The first being all thinking, reasoning, intelligent subjects; the second being what we see, hear, taste, feel &c. He admitted that what we call external things had a real existence, but only when perceived. Few men looking at the moon see not one, but ten moons, each being an idea in their minds. I cannot believe that Idealism as a system can be conceivable; I am certain that it has never been acted upon in every-day life. The belief, that consciousness forces upon us every moment of our existence, cannot be eradicated by arguments, however plausible. Yet these doctrines lead to the contradiction of a fundamental belief, to a denial of the veracity of the testimony of consciousness. All the moving bodies he sees are to every man virtually but ideas: he may with safety predicate his own existence alone and yet disciples of the Idealistic school, more unscrupulous than Berkeley, consider this a doubtful step, perhaps an ungrounded liberty. Ideal water-falls drive ideal mills, which have a separate existence in the minds of the miller and the mill boy. A law of gravitation holds together an ideal universe, that has no existence without the mind. An ideal body wears out and frees a real soul. A want of ideal food and money drives men to destroy an everlasting spirit. Heaven, where spirits hold sweet spiritual communion together, differs from earth in this alone that here we spirits are tormented and corrupted by an ideal world, that we are delusively compelled to regard, as a real material, external existence. What then means the earth we live in, the sun and moon and stars we see, the angry thunder and the roaring cataract. What madness gave eyes and ears to see and hear that which is as unextended and as spiritual, as our souls themselves?

Over all that we perceive by our senses, he says, we have not the slightest control. But what we perceive by our senses he calls ideas. Now men certainly think that they have control over ideas; as for instance I know that if I go into a certain forest, I shall see there a spring, "but our ideas are imprinted on the mind by a spirit distinct from us," and we control them not at all. If we can doubt of our control over what we shall see, do, or feel, we may likewise doubt our control over what we shall say or think, and may suppose that our other mental modifica-

cations are also imprinted on our minds by a spirit distinct from us. With the fall of our control over sense-perception, falls our control over self-perception. But from this state of affairs come two very formidable deductions.

1. The existence of subject and object would be annihilated, and we would consist of a series of thoughts, sensations and ideas, over which we have no control, but which are the mechanism of some blind chance or created and dispensed by the wisdom of a supreme Being. Thus mind itself would at last be sacrificed to those very principles, whose express object is to glorify it.

2. That great fundamental principle of man's free agency declared in Revelation, incorporate with our very being and involved in the relation of Creator and created, falls. And thus not content with denying reality to all that seems solid in creation, the Idealist deprives of its glory the last resource of the simple believer, and demonstrates that the whole end of man's creation is a sublimely mechanical idea. For the ideas of the external world are limited and bound down by immutable and universal laws, and as upon Berkeley's hypothesis there seems ground to suppose that all the phenomena and affections of our minds also are governed by similar immutable laws, together they would demonstrate rather the creation of a blind fate than that of an intelligent Creator.

Let us then, still confiding in consciousness, our senses and our common sense, bid fare-well to this philosophy of dream-land, to this doctrine of doubts and of shadows, assured that the greatest arguments against it will be the monstrous absurdities of its wisest disciples.

ARTICLE VI.

LONELINESS OF HAMLET.

By Rev. E. FERRIER, A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College.

The contrast between the Hamlet and Macbeth of Shakspeare is of the most marked character. Macbeth is all

action. We are hurried along amid wars, rebellions, crimes, from point to point, almost as on the bosom of a rapid stream. It is full of the noise and bustle of a stirring world. Hence it is easily understood, and one of the most popular of dramas. Not so with Hamlet. It addresses itself more to the reflective faculty. It is all thought. The ghost of a murdered King throws across it a mystery which has never been penetrated. There are problems which the shrewdest criticisms of centuries have not solved. The soliloquies, the real or feigned madness of Hamlet, his strange and seemingly cruel treatment of the young, beautiful and artless Ophelia, suggest questions which press the mind of every intelligent reader for an answer.

As shedding some faint light on these features of this most wonderful drama, and explaining in some degree the strange conduct of one of the most mysterious characters ever drawn by the Prince of dramatists, we propose to develop and illustrate the thought—The loneliness of Hamlet.

Real solitude pertains to the mind and heart rather than the body. We may be alone in the streets of a crowded city, or amid a throng pressing on in business and pleasure. Hands may touch ours, but there may be no kindred fellowship of spirit. We may look into each other's faces, but there is no meeting of heart. Words may fall from our lips, but they come back like an echo, through a dreary solitude. Such a loneliness is deeper, and more real, and more oppressive, than if we dwelt on the mountain top, or in the desert, the birds and beasts our only companions.

Hamlet, son of the murdered King of Denmark, is of princely beauty. He is with the crowd of heartless courtiers and politicians that gather for royal favor. He is brought in close contact with their interests and schemes and projects. But while Claudius, the murderer, is making firm the royal State, and the falsehood as to the fate of the late unhappy King is widely circulated, and credited, the ghost of the murdered father appears to the son. It is significant that nearly the whole of the first Act is occupied in the interview between the ghost and Hamlet.

A great secret is put in possession of the son. It comes from the supernatural world. A spirit is the bearer of the secret. So holy and so sacred is the communication, that it shall not be spoken, until Hamlet is alone.

It must not fall on other ears. That is a thrilling part of the drama where the strange visitor beckons Hamlet apart from the rest, to impart the appalling secret. While Hamlet is at first amazed, and cries out:

"Angels and Ministers of grace defend us!
Be thou a spirit of health, or a goblin damned?
Bring with thee airs from Heaven, or blasts from hell?
Be thy intents, wicked or charitable,
Thou comest in such a questionable shape,
That I will speak to thee: I'll call thee Hamlet,
King, father, royal Dane, O, answer me, and tell me
Why thy canonized bones, hearsed in death
Have burst their cerements,"

and Horatio warns him:

What if it tempt you toward the flood, my Lord,
Or to the dreadful summit of the cliff,
That beetles o'er his base into the Sea,
And there assume some other humble form,
Which might deprive your sovereignty of reason,
And draw you into madness,"

Yet in spite of perplexity and admonition, the Prince breaks from Horatio and Marcellus with the exclamation:

My fate cries out,
And makes each petty artery in this body,
As hardy as the Nemean lion's nerve.
Still I am called; unband me, gentlemen;
By Heaven! I'll make a ghost of him that hinders me."

That lonely interview between the ghost and Hamlet is the key to the whole play. It has peculiar significance. Like one of the opening utterances in *Julius Cæsar*.

"These growing feathers plucked from Cæsar's wing
Will make him fly an ordinary pitch,
Who else would soar above the view of men
And keep us all in servile fearfulness,"

pointing to the spot where great Julius fell; like the resolution of Lear: "I'll crawl unburthened to the grave," spreading its deep significance over the whole complicated plot, like a flash of lightning in the night of darkness opening to the vision the broad landscape, thus for profound meaning stands at the opening of this drama, the

solemn conference between Hamlet and the ghost. At this meeting, the dreadful secret of murder is put in possession of the Prince :

" Know thou noble youth,
The Serpent that did sting thy father's life,
Now wears his crown."

The dread secret is not only communicated, but the charge given :

" If thou hast nature in thee, bear it not ;
Let not the royal bed of Denmark be
A couch for luxury and incest ;
But, however thou pursuest this act,
Taint not thy mind; nor let thy soul contrive
Against thy mother aught; leave her to Heaven,
And to those thorns that in her bosom lodge,
To prick and sting her."

Note thus his position. The great task of retributive justice has been committed to him. He has been supernaturally entrusted with a secret of the most fearful kind ; a secret which he durst not impart to any mortal ear.—How it separated him from the whole world ! It made an impassable chasm between him and all other men. What cared he for court-schemes and interests, just fresh from the vision of a murdered father, and his sight daily pained with her who had married the uncle :

Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous tears,
Had left the flushing in her galled eyes ?"

He feels himself singled out of heaven. The interview fills him from the crown to the toe, top-full of the direst vengeance—and he vows :

" I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
That youth and observation copied there ;
And thy commandment all alone shall live
Within the book and volume of my brain,
Unmixed with baser matter : yes, by heaven,"

This necessary loneliness of Hamlet accounts for one marked feature of this drama. No other drama of Shakespeare contains such lengthy *soliloquies*. They are the utter-

ances of an overburdened heart. They are the natural effusions of a soul, that possessed a secret which could not be committed. While the suspicion only of murder is rankling in his bosom, and he is pressed to earth with a sense of his desolate condition, he says :

“ O, that this too, too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew !
Or that the everlasting had not fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter. O God,
How weary, stale and unprofitable,
Seem to me all the uses of this world.”

And after the dread secret of his life has been imparted, he relieves his burdened spirit in a soliloquy, containing arguments for suicide that make one tremble. They are so much like the address of despair to the Red Cross Knight, that Shakspeare must have read the Faery Queen of Spenser :

For what hath life, that it may loved make,
And give not rather cause it to forsake ?
Fear, sickness, age, loss, labor, sorrow, strife,
Pain, hunger, cold, that makes the heart to quake ;
And ever fickle fortune rageth rife,
All which, and thousands more, do make a loathsome life.
Die shall all flesh ? What then must needs be done,
Is it not better to do willingly,
Than linger till the glass be all out-run ?
Death is the end of woes. Die soon, O Faery's son.”

It is the same argument which we hear from Giant Despair, from those huge keeps, and moss-grown, frowning battlements of Doubting Castle in Pilgrim's Progress. In these cries of despondency, in these wails of despair in Hamlet, he moves before us, as one upon whose soul too great an action has been laid. The burden is so heavy that he would sink beneath it, in the grave. The mission of revenge is too mighty for one so weak. As one has said : “ It is an oak tree, planted in a costly jar, which should have borne only pleasant flowers in its bosom ; the roots expand, the jar is shivered.”

It is thus we explain the failure of Hamlet to execute the purpose of his life, when he had the King in his power. While the King is engaged in his prayers, the work of vengeance might have been done. He flings away the op-

portunity, for which he had long been watching, and retreats with the determination.

"Up sword ; and know thou a more horrid hent."

It was evidence of his weakness for the purpose, to which he had been commissioned. The native hue of resolution was sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought ; an enterprise of great pith and moment was, indeed, turned awry, and lost the name of action. Hamlet, naturally reflective, weak, moody, is crippled still more for action, by his over-weighty burden, and is kept from throwing it off with the hand of a suicide, only by the great thought of a world to come.

"The dread of something after death,
The undiscovered country, from whose bourne,
No traveller returns, puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have,
Than fly to others, that we know not of."

Like Macbeth, when the "genius and the mortal instruments, were all in council," as to the death of the "gracious Duncan," it was all clear enough :

"If this assassination
Could trammel up the consequence, and catch
With his surcease, success ; that but this blow
Might be the be-all, and the end-all here ;
But here, upon this bank and shoal of time,
We'll jump the life to come."

Oh ! that great thought of a world to come, and a judgment ! It palsied the arm of Macbeth, whose brandished steel on the field of battle smoked with bloody execution ; it made the sword fall harmless from the hand of Hamlet, when he might have struck down his victim. Who knows how many plans of wickedness have fled before this great thought of a personal immortality, how many strong hearts have quailed before its power ?

Let us in the next place, in the light of this loneliness of Hamlet, look at the much vexed question of his conduct toward Ophelia. Ophelia is one of the most interesting characters which genius has ever drawn. Innocent, artless, confiding, beautiful, she appears in marked contrast with the loftiness and grandeur of the Prince. We are constrained to believe that the affection of Hamlet for

Ophelia was of the deepest and purest kind. He had given countenance to his speech, with almost all the holy vows of heaven; and in that wonderful closing scene, when the funeral procession enters the church' yard with the dead body of Ophelia, Hamlet, roused into a noble energy at the sight of the pale corpse, and excited by the empty and hollow show of grief, says:

"I loved Ophelia; forty thousand brothers,
Could not, with all their quantity of love,
Make up my sum."

Why then the seemingly cruel and heartless treatment of one whom he loved so devotedly? In that conversation with her which follows the soliloquy on suicide, the unkind words addressed to the gentle Ophelia in answer to her inquiries, strike us with surprise. They drive her to grief and madness. The conversation is colored with those feelings of despair, to which he had just given utterance. Despair dare not love, but rather finds a wretched pleasure in tormenting the object of its affection: "Get thee to a nunnery. I have heard of your paintings too, well enough; God has given you one face, and you make yourself another, you jig, you amble and you lisp, and nick-name God's creatures, and make your wantonness your ignorance. Go to, I'll no more of it; it hath made me mad." He seems to have forgotten the past, and his language breathes only bitter irony, and suspicion of all female virtue and constancy.

There is nothing unnatural here. It is the just growth of that thing which was lodged in his heart by the ghost of his murdered father. It is the surrender of all things for the accomplishment of a work, committed to him, by a supernatural power. His conduct is in perfect accordance with the vow he made under the most solemn circumstances. "I'll wipe away all trivial fond records from the table of my memory." The weak man gives up all for a work which was too great for him. History, both sacred and profane, is crowded with illustrations where men have crushed out the affections of the heart for the attainment of a favorite object. When the imagination of Lady Macbeth has been inflamed with the splendor of a crown, and the gilded trappings of royalty, she shrieks out, like one of those very witches who had beguiled her husband: "Come, ye spirits, that tend on mortal thoughts, make thick my blood; stop the access and passage to remorse. Come

to my woman's breasts, and take my milk for gall, you murdering ministers." Illustrations may be found, noble or debased in their character, as the purpose possessed the soul and animated the life. One of the most striking cases is the Son of God. The grandest of all ideas lodged in his divine bosom, was the mystery of Redemption. His mission was the rescue of uncounted thousands from the doom of the second death; and with this work full before him, more than once, in the prosecution of his high object, he seems to trample on human relations. When his parents sought him in the temple, he said as if in half-defiance of parental authority: "Wist ye not that I must be about my father's business?" When certain ones told him that his mother waited for him without, pointing to his disciples near him, he said: "These are my father and my mother and my brethren;" and on the occasion of that first miracle, when his mother remarked to him, "They have no wine," he replied in a way which has tasked the ingenuity of some critics to reconcile with his heavenly temper: "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." In this light, it seems strange that dramatic critics have dwelt at such length on the behavior of Hamlet towards Cordelia, and even charged Shakspeare with want of truthfulness to nature. The pages of history, all along down the ages, are written over with the truth. That apostle whom the Son of God commissioned to carry the word among the Gentiles, declares in the same spirit of unreserved surrender to his chosen work: "I am determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified." Paul, in the likeness of an angel from heaven, but Hamlet like a fiend from the pit, his heart on fire with revenge, says: "I am determined to know nothing—not home, nor friend, nor lover—until I accomplish the will of my murdered father." What sacrifice has not thriftless ambition, that will raven up its own life's means," again and again made, for the attainment of its object? When the heart of Bonaparte swelled with the ambition of making Europe his empire, and himself the occupant of a throne that for splendor should more than rival those of the Ptolemies or Cæsars, sooner than any thing, shall in the least hinder his purpose, he crushes the affections of a woman who had been his pride and his honor. For out and out cruelty, and wanton disregard of innocence and worth, the divorce of Josephine

may well be placed by the side of Hamlet's treatment of the fair Ophelia. The occasion of both misfortunes was, they stood in the way of projects, to which great souls had surrendered every faculty. Among those of princely beauty and royal worth that assembled in the court of the haughty virgin Queen of England, there was one, ever, the observed of all observers. Courtly, of more than ordinary elegance of manners, the Earl of Leicester shone the brightest of that gay throng. Yet his name is linked with an event in English history, that makes the heart bleed. Inspired with the hope of sharing the throne of the nation with Elizabeth, he permitted the countess, his wife, one of the queenliest of English women, to be put to death in the most shocking manner. He had looked at the dazzling object of his ambition so long, and so intently, that he was blinded to all else, and he who would drop a tear over the grieved and wronged, and maddened Ophelia of Hamlet, must pause in like spirit over the injured, the murdered countess, the Amy Robsart, of Sir Walter Scott's *Kenilworth*.

The third feature of this drama, and one which has given rise to much discussion, is the feigned or real madness of Hamlet. The more I have examined this question, I am disposed to think the madness was in the beginning feigned, and ultimately became real. He thought it meet to put an "antic disposition" on, for the accomplishment of his object. The feigned madness is closely connected with the whole plot. As Brutus played the idiot at court, that he might more surely remove the hated Tarquin, or as Kent in *King Lear*, that he might befriend the aged monarch in his toilsome pilgrimage after banishment from his daughter's home, in speech and conduct, behaved as one bereft of reason, thus Hamlet, so completely plays the maniac that Ophelia exclaims :

"O, what noble mind is here o'erthrown !
The expectancy and rose of the fair state,
The glass of fashion and the mould of form,
The observed of all observed, quite, quite down."

This disguise would give him access to all parts of the palace. His rambling here and there, in this feint, would excite no suspicion. It was a stratagem which the turbulent condition of his thoughts would naturally adopt. It was thus he actually lighted upon the King at his prayers,

alone and defenceless, and was afforded such favorable opportunity of striking the fatal blow. It certainly was less toilsome for his spirit, to wear the wild mask of insanity, than in such a court, in the presence of a murderer, and a dishonored mother, to keep up the counterfeit of a smooth, unruffled and contented aspect.

But this disguise of madness served a higher purpose, than simply a mode to advance the project of destroying the King. As we have remarked, the secret which had been committed to his keeping by a messenger from the other world, was one of the most dreadful character. If we held such a thing, it would crush or madden us to retain it. The feelings crowding our breast would be intolerable. It would be like a fire shut up in the bones, consuming in its influence. Hence, this outer show of madness furnished a vent for those pent-up forces, which were enough to unsettle the foundations of his being. It afforded scope for those feelings of distrust and disquietude, which could not be concealed. Those utterances of the maniac Hamlet, therefore, are not simply cold invention to support a fictitious madness, they exhibit the real temper of the man. The sarcasm, the disgust, the turbulence are all from the heart, the faithful expression of his inner life, sheltered by the incoherence and conduct of a maniac. Hence, in his wildest ravings, aged Polonius is forced to own: "Though this be madness, yet there is method in it. How pregnant sometimes his replies are. "A happiness that often madness hits on which reason and sanity could not so prosperously be delivered of." Scope was thus given for those disquieted feelings which could not be concealed.

One of the most remarkable parts of this drama is in the 3d Act, where in the hall of the castle, an entertainment of a dramatic kind is arranged. It is complete in itself, and is really a play within a play. The whole contrivance is designed to "catch the conscience" of the King, and make the crown for which he had taken the life of a brother, rest very uneasily on his brows. While on the one hand, again, it furnishes an opening for the escape of the wild commotion and turbulence which crowded the heart of Hamlet, on the other, it so quickens the guilt of the wretched King, that he says in agony.

O, my offence is rank, it smells to heaven;
It hath the primal eldest curse upon it,

A brother's murder. What, if this cursed hand
 Were thicker than itself with brother's blood;
 Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens
 To wash it white as snow?"

And with this thought of guilt in his heart, and this hope of mercy before him, he tries to pray, but in heaviness owns:

"My words fly up, my thoughts remain below;
 Words without thoughts never to heaven go."

The advice of Hamlet to the players in this connection, beginning: "Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue," is one of the most remarkable passages in the whole English language. It is an epitome of all the principles of good elocution. There is more good sense, and discriminating advice given to speakers in this brief compass, than could be gathered from whole volumes on the subject, and he who can catch the meaning, and apply the principles here so admirably indicated, needs no other work on Oratory. Additional interest is given to this passage by the unquestioned historic fact, that Shakspeare through it, intended to give a sharp and merited rebuke to the prevailing style of elocution in the drama. It was true in those days, some of their most popular speakers, had "neither the accent of Christian, nor the gait of Christian—they strutted and bellowed as if some of nature's journeymen had made them, and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably."

But while the madness of Hamlet at the beginning, for the double reason which we have assigned, was altogether assumed, before the closing of the scene it became real. In the closing act, specially, there is scarcely a word or action, that does not indicate the maniac indeed.

"That noble and most sovereign reason,
 Like sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh."

For a full, and harmonious, and well developed manhood, there must be some correspondence between the reflective and perceptive faculties of our being. The undue enlargement of either one, at the cost of the other, will not give us the highest style of man. The man of disproportioned reflective powers becomes moody, morbid, jealous, a habitation for various disturbing influences. When

those currents, from any arresting cause, which God designed should flow outward, unobstructed, are turned backward upon the soul, the waters become restless and turbulent.

It is the most grievous of misfortunes to feel that those invisible cords of sympathy, which unite us with the outer world, have been severed. It is really the beginning of a derangement bordering on insanity. Byron felt thus, and in his isolation, colored his poetry with a gloom, which like an infection, communicates its secret influence to all who read. Richard III. felt thus, because of his deformity, and the thought drove him to a life of villainy :

"I, that am rudely stamped, and want loves's majesty,
I, that am curtailed of this fair proportion,
I am determined to prove a villain,
And hate the idle pleasures of these days."

Such was the feeling of Shelley, and the feeling was poured out in a strain of bitterness, in his notes on *Queen Mab*, which has scarce an equal in any literature. And his *Alastor* or *Spirit of Solitude*, with all its poetical beauty, is but one long, loud wail, wrung from a heart that felt its loneliness. Men of reflective habits of mind should be on their guard against this subtle temptation. We need earnest, wholesome contact with the outer world, that we may exhibit that gladness of spirit, and that cheerfulness, which add so much to our happiness. The world is full of books, which are filled with these brighter colorings of mind, and it is not true, as has been alleged, that Byron with his gloom, Shelley with his bitterness, and Rousseau with his morbidity, are fair types of the class. Sadness and dejection are not the marks of genius. The French essayist Montaigne shows us in one of his quaint essays, that continual cheerfulness is the most indisputable sign of wisdom, and he tells the old story of Demetrius the grammarian, who finding in the temple at Delphi a knot of philosophers chatting away in high glee and comfort, said "I am greatly mistaken, gentlemen, as by your pleasant countenances, you are not engaged in any very profound discourse. Whereon Heracleon answered the grammarian : Pshaw, my good friend ! It does very well for fellows who live in a perpetual anxiety to know

whether the future tense of the verb *shall* should be spelled with one *s*, or two, to knit their brows and look solemn; but we who are engaged in discoursing *true* philosophy, are cheerful as a matter of course."

Hamlet, by the very constitution of his nature, belonged to the class of moping, moody, lonely creatures. He said truly, when he told the Queen:

"'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother,
Nor customary suits of solemn black,
That can denote me truly;
But I have that within, which passes show."

The peculiar circumstances which surrounded him forced him in a still deeper loneliness, until the man of sentiment and reflection becomes the madman. It is that disease, engendered by looking too exclusively, and too intently inward. Hence there is no play of Shakspeare where we find so much of the reflective as in Hamlet. Thought is one of its great features. It is in Hamlet that we find that sublime apostrophe on the greatness of man. "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a God! the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals!" Or that other just and familiar reflection: "What is a man, if his chief good and market of his time, be but to sleep, and to feed? a beast, no more. Sure, he that made us with such large discourse, looking before and after, gave us not that capability and God-like reason to fust in us unused." We might multiply illustrations. The feature reappears in almost every utterance of Hamlet. The mind is ever feeding upon itself. If he cherishes a passion, he pauses the next moment to scrutinize it. If he forms a purpose, he stops to make it a subject of reflection. The author of this drama, with one of the highest efforts of his genius, has seized upon, and fixed for our study those deep, yet wayward feelings, which seem to be the changeful creatures of the mind alone—such apparently causeless things as Antonio speaks of in the Merchant of Venice:

"In sooth, I know not why I am so sad;
It wearies me; you say it wearies you;
But how I caught it, found it, or came by it,

What stuff 'tis made of, whereof it is born,
I am to learn."^{*}

It is in a deeper region that Shakspeare enters, in among those aimless aspirations of melancholy, those discontents which frame no wish—that meditative vacancy which spurns the detail of human existence, than when in the *Tempest*, he ranges through the kingdom of fairies, or in *Macbeth* and *Lear*, he makes tributary the world of spirits.

The catastrophe of the whole drama is contained in the last Act. And what a summing up it is. What a convention of agonies. "One woe doth tread upon another's heels."^{**} The madness of Hamlet spreads its gloom over the whole scene. Polonius has been slain, and dragged on the scene by the maniac. Ophelia has committed suicide by drowning, and the funeral procession is entering the church-yard. The Queen dies by poison. Laertes is slain. The guilty King is stabbed. Hamlet himself after that famous soliloquy on the skull of poor Yorick, dies by his own hand. What a cluster of misfortunes. What a gathering together of wars and agonies in small compass."

It is quite a different close from what we would expect in a modern novel. In spite of the occasional coarseness, more the product of the age in which our author lived, than any individual love for impurity, the atmosphere that gathers about these dramas, is essentially bracing in its influence. Shakspeare omits nothing, on the bright side or the dark side of life, that has relation to our moral nature. No other genius has ever so entered into the souls of the guilty, and shown us the desperation and the darkness that dwells in them; so shown us the spirit of the wicked, that "is like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt;" so shown us the "dull misery of exhausted vice, still and dreary in its ruin," and conscious of existence only in remorse, shame or anguish.

The drama to which our attention has been turned is a most impressive exhibition of the truth: "Seek not to avenge yourselves. Vengeance is mine. I will repay, saith the Lord of Hosts." Throughout this play, if it shows us the bitterness of revenge, it points us also to

^{*}Act 1. Scene 1.

those after-fires of remorse, which are kindled, as fierce and as hot as the burnings of torment. Its jealousy is as cruel as the grave, its envy as corroding as a canker, its outbursts of anger as desolating as the fires of the volcano, and that fever which preys upon the heart of ambition, whether in a Caesar or a Macbeth, withering as a Simoon to all peace. We rejoice then in the growing and expanding influence of this, one of our great English classics. We rejoice that all around the globe, where our simple tongue is spoken, in America, in Britain and Europe, among the millions who are to fill Australia, and over every habitable spot that gleams in the Pacific, among the almost unnumbered multitudes of India, where "British authority, British profit, and British ambition will give a predominance to our language," will this author, fresh, strong, rich and pure in his dialect, be recognized as our Representative. And we may venture the prediction, based on the remarkable revival of the study of the old English authors, so long as Falstaff can make men laugh, or Lear with his venerable hairs make them weep—as long as the innocence and beauty of Miranda can charm, or the murderous guilt of Lady Macbeth appall us, will our author be recognized as a power in the hearts of men.

ARTICLE VII.

KANZEL-GEMEINSCHAFT, OR EXCHANGE OF PULPITS.

By REV. A. J. WEDDELL, A. M., Norristown, Pa.

"We hold, that the purity of the pulpit should be guarded with the most conscientious care, and that no man should be admitted to our pulpits, whether of the Lutheran name, or any other, of whom there is just reason to doubt, whether he will preach the pure truth of God's word, as taught in the Confessions of our Church."—General Council, 1868.

Every age has its living issues. These issues are not always new; but they appear in new relations, and in new combinations. Such is the question de-

signated by the English phrase, Exchange of Pulpits, and by the German word, *Kanzel-Gemeinschaft*. This, although discussed in other Churches, and in other places, is a novelty in the Lutheran Church, on this side of the Atlantic. It is of European extraction, and originated in the fierce religious antagonisms, engendered by the union of Church and State. An enforced liberality, on the one hand, led to rigid exclusiveness on the other. Lutherans, smarting under the lash of persecution, occasioned by the compulsory union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, regarded that connection as the prime source of all the evils, under which they were suffering; and under the influence of a re-actionary movement, entered their protest against the hated union, by determining to exclude the Reformed, as such, both from their Pulpit and Communion Table. In the course of time, many who had participated in the unionistic conflict in Europe, immigrated to America, and brought with them the views and feelings, developed in the fierce contests through which they had passed. Here, finding no civil law interfering with ecclesiastical discipline, they commenced the organization of congregations and synods, upon the rigid principles which they had adopted. Their motto was: "No *Kanzel-Gemeinschaft*,"—"No Communion with sectarians."

As these principles and practices existed almost solely among ministers and congregations purely German, they attracted but little attention, outside of the sphere in which they were operating. But, in the formation of the General Council, which was intended to be a union of Lutheran Synods upon a strict Lutheran basis, such principles and practices could not be ignored; and *Kanzel-Gemeinschaft*, or Exchange of Pulpits with ministers of other denominations, became one of the questions involved in the proposed union. This question, although now more immediately connected with the General Council, and certain Western Synods, is a thing of general interest for the whole Lutheran Church. It cannot be put to rest by denunciation, indifference, or a sneer. It involves a principle, fundamental in the relations of the different portions of Christendom to each other, and must be fairly met, upon the grounds of truth, with sound Christian logic, and settled by fair and honest argument.

In entering upon the discussion of this subject, it will be proper, first, to set forth clearly, and definitely, the pre-

cise issue under consideration. This is not fully expressed in the language, in which the question is generally stated. The proposition is unlimited in the extent of its application, and may include all denominations and sects in Christendom. Both parties, however, agree in excluding entirely from Lutheran pulpits, all so-called Christian ministers, who deny any of the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith, contained in the Catholic Symbols of the Church. The question must, therefore, be *limited* to those usually styled orthodox, and, for brevity's sake, we will use the generic term, *Reformed*, as designating all such non-Lutheran organizations or churches.

But, the relation contemplated in the question, is also not clearly expressed in the terms which are employed. *Kanzel-Gemeinschaft*, the original German word used, implies a *pulpit-partnership*, a *collegiate* pastorate of Lutheran and Reformed pastors. This is not claimed, and, therefore, must be excluded from the question. Such a joint occupation of pulpits has no advocates, as far as we know, in the Lutheran Church in America. The English statement of the question, is scarcely more satisfactory than the German. We will, therefore, in a series of propositions, both negative and positive, endeavor to present the real issue, and discuss it from a true, scriptural and Lutheran stand-point.

1. *May a Lutheran Congregation have a Reformed Pastor?* On this, there is no difference of opinion. All parties agree in the negative. Whether such a relation might be allowable in some abnormal condition of the Church, as when a congregation, under extraordinary circumstances, is cut off from the means of grace, is certainly not contemplated in the question.

2. *Shall a Reformed Minister be permitted to preach the anti-Lutheran distinctive peculiarities of his faith in a Lutheran pulpit?* On this point there is an agreement among all those, who themselves receive and teach the doctrines of the word of God, as set forth in our Confessions. We all answer, *No!* The pastor and vestry of every Lutheran congregation, are solemnly pledged to preserve the doctrinal purity of its pulpit, and are responsible for the doctrines taught in it. To allow any one to preach doctrines condemned in our Confessions, and believed by themselves to be contrary to the word of God, would be a violation of their sacred obligation. Such a policy would

exhibit an indifference to divine truth, or be a manifestation of a wavering and undecided faith.

3. *May a Lutheran Pastor and congregation exclude all non-Lutheran Ministers from their pulpit?* Here again we agree. The right undoubtedly exists. It is a question purely within the domain of congregational polity, which each congregation, with its pastor, has a right to decide for itself. Those, who conscientiously allow Reformed ministers to officiate occasionally in their pulpits, accord to other pastors and congregations the right to *exclude* them.

4. *Ought ALL Reformed Ministers to be allowed to preach in our pulpits?* All answer, *No!* An indiscriminate interchange of pulpits, has no advocates among us. The admission of Reformed ministers into our pulpits is not claimed as a general rule, but simply as *allowable exceptions*, to be controlled by time, place and circumstances, according to the conscientious judgment of the parties concerned. So far the advocates and opponents of *Kanzel-Gemeinschaft*, or Exchange of Pulpits, agree. We now come to the point of divergence.

5. *Is it lawful for a Lutheran Pastor and congregation, to invite a Reformed Minister, known to hold the Reformed faith, to preach, in their pulpit, those doctrines and views of Christian ethics, in which he and his particular Confession agree with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church?*

This is the entire question now at issue among us, fully and clearly stated. The answer to it must be categorical,—*Yea*, or *Nay*. There can be no evasion. We affirm. Others deny.

That a Reformed minister, when invited, can occupy, occasionally, a Lutheran pulpit, preaching only what accords with Lutheran doctrine and practice, cannot be denied. The points of agreement between the Confessions of the leading orthodox Churches, and our own Confessions, are many; in some cases, the points of difference are very few. On the great doctrines of the Catholic creeds, Christian life and morals, there is almost entire harmony. Hence the Reformed minister, on very many subjects within the ordinary range of preaching, can fully and freely express his honest convictions of truth, which will be in accordance with the faith of the Lutheran Church, as well as with that of his own. The commendation often bestowed by strict Lutherans, upon the writings of Reformed theologians, is proof conclusive of this fact.

The propriety and rectitude of abstaining from controverted topics, on such occasions, where their introduction would result in evil, and not good, must be admitted by every one, not afflicted with the *rabie theologorum*. In it, in ordinary cases, there is no compromise of principles, and no violation of an enlightened conscience. Hence, there are no *moral grounds*, which would prevent a Reformed minister, from avoiding controverted questions in a Lutheran pulpit, or a Lutheran minister, doing the same thing in a Reformed pulpit.

But the unlawfulness of the practice contemplated in the question of exchange of pulpits, may be argued from four positions. These we will examine in order.

1. It is unlawful to invite Reformed ministers to preach an occasional sermon in a Lutheran pulpit, because they are *not Christian ministers of Christian churches*. This is the only argument in the case really worth anything. If valid, it would be decisive. But we are not aware, that it is claimed, to any extent, by the opponents of pulpit exchanges. It is, however, the fundamental principle involved in the whole issue. But aside from this particular instance, the Christian character of the Reformed churches, and the validity of their ministry are admitted by us, in theory and practice. In evidence of this fact, we adduce, the testimony of current Lutheran literature, historical, theological, and periodical.

To claim, either directly or indirectly, that the Lutheran Church, in its organic form, is the *only*, and the *entire* Christian Church in the world, is as absurd, as the arrogant assumptions of the English episcopacy. Such a theory must regard the greater portion of the Christian world as Churchless, and without a Christian ministry, and must pronounce the love, faith, piety, and holy lives, of the millions outside of the Lutheran Church, as delusions of Satan; or it must admit, that there is, at least, as much Christianity outside of the church as in it. We hold, that the Lutheran Church is the one historic, Holy, Christian Church, but, by *no means all of it*. We hold equally, that, not in outward organic connection with us, there are other portions of the Christian Church, with true Christians, and a valid Christian ministry, and only defective so far, as they do not, in all points, come up, to what we believe to be the full and clear teachings of the word of God.

2. It is considered unlawful to admit a minister of the Reformed churches, into a Lutheran pulpit, because the act, *per se*, implies an *approval* of his errors, or, at least, *indifference* toward them. This argument has some plausibility; but a slight examination will expose its weakness.

An invitation extended to a Reformed minister to preach, in a Lutheran pulpit, doctrines and ethics which accord with the Confessions of our Church, is an acknowledgment of his office as a Christian minister, and an endorsement of the doctrines which he is supposed to preach; but, it cannot be construed into an approval of other doctrines which he may be known to hold. Now, as this acknowledgment of the Reformed ministry, already exists, and as we necessarily approve of their doctrines *as far as* they accord with our own faith, it follows, that neither the acknowledgment of office, nor the approval of certain doctrines, is created by the invitation, and therefore, neither the one, nor the other can be pleaded in bar against it.

That nothing more is implied in the contemplated invitation, than this acknowledgment of ministerial office, and the approval of certain doctrines, is evident from the facts in the case. (a) The doctrinal position of the Lutheran pastor, and his congregation has been definitely, and publicly set forth, in their reception of the Confessions of our Church, and therefore, the reception of a Reformed minister, understood to preach at that time nothing contrary to those Confessions, cannot possibly imply, an approval of any errors that he may hold. (b) The invitation to occupy a Lutheran pulpit, is always given with the implied condition that nothing is to be preached contrary to our Confessions of faith, and is understood by all parties to have been so accepted. (c) The public mind does not impute to a Lutheran pastor, or congregation, extending such invitation, either an approval of non-Lutheran doctrines or indifference towards them. (d) If an invitation to occupy a pulpit, implies an approval of *all* the doctrines, known to be held by the person invited, it also implies an *approval* of his entire *life, sins, weakness and all*.

From these facts and considerations it must appear evident, that this second position is untenable, and the argu-

ment derived from it, inapplicable to the question at issue.

3. To invite a Reformed minister to preach in a Lutheran pulpit, is contrary to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, and is, therefore, unlawful. An appeal to the Confessions is legitimate, but the arguments, derived from that source, to prove a point made a test of Lutheran fellowship, in order to be valid, must be *clear and decided*. No mere influences can be accepted. If there is a law, we must have the very words of it. But, we have searched in vain in the Symbols for such a prohibitory law, and we have found none, because there really is none. The whole argument used in the case is purely inferential and indecisive. When our Confessions were framed, Protestantism had not fully developed itself, and our modern conception of distinct organic denominations was unknown. The Christian Church was contemplated, as made up of all nominal Christian congregations, more or less pure in doctrine and practice, and hence, there is an absence of anything applying directly to the grand organic divisions of the Church, as they now exist. We will, however, examine the leading passages in our Confessions, which may be considered as bearing upon the subject.

The Augsburg Confession, on ecclesiastical orders, says, in Art. XIV. "Concerning ecclesiastical orders (Church government) they teach, that no man should publicly in the church, teach or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called." In the application of this article, in its original sense and intent, the only question that can be raised is: Are the persons under consideration "rightly called;" that is: Are they regularly ordained Christian ministers? If the validity of the ordination of Reformed ministers is admitted, as it is, then, the conditions of this article are met, and it cannot be used as an argument against their occasional admission into a Lutheran pulpit.

The condemnatory clauses of our Confessions are considered by some as implying the prohibitory principles which are claimed. The Augsburg Confession condemns gross heretics, but simply declares its disapproval of those who teach certain doctrines contrary to its statements: in other cases it is merely said, "the opposite doctrine is rejected." The signers of the Formula of Concord, in the Preface, evidently give the sense and intent of these con-

demnatory clauses, when they say: "It never was our design or resolution, to condemn those men who fall into error through an innocent simplicity of mind, and yet are no blasphemers against the truth of divine doctrine, much less to condemn all Churches, that are even under the Roman power * *; but it was rather our design and intention, publicly to reprehend and condemn all fanatical opinions and the obstinate teachers of them, and those blasphemers too, who, we believe, ought by no means to be endured in our dominions, our churches, or our schools." This, it is true, is not confessional, but it is of historical value in determining the sense of our Confessions. It mentions two classes of men. The second class is composed of "blasphemers," and obstinate teachers of fanatical opinions," who, it is said, "ought not to be endured in our churches and schools." The logical conclusion must be, therefore, that the first class mentioned are *not* to be entirely *excluded*, as they are not even condemned. Now it is exactly this class of men, that we claim the privilege of inviting occasionally into our pulpits. They are men, who have inherited their faith; who honestly and sincerely believe, that it is in accordance with the word of God, but who entertain a profound respect for the faith of the Lutheran Church, even where they conscientiously differ from it. For others we claim no such privileges.

The argument, derived from the Formula of Concord as explained by its signers, or framers, is therefore, not *against* the admission of pious and godly ministers of other Churches into Lutheran pulpits, but in *favor* of it. This settles the question, as far as our Confessions are concerned.

4. The fourth argument against "Exchange of Pulpits" with Reformed ministers of approved general Christian orthodoxy, is derived from the word of God. For the sake of brevity, we will confine ourselves to the examination of a few of the passages usually relied on, as they contain the sum and substance of all others claimed; and the answer to them, will be applicable to all. The strongest scriptural declarations bearing upon the subject of ministerial intercourse are found in 1 Tim. 6: 3—5. The Apostle says: "If any man teach otherwise and consent, not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about

questions, and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: *from such withdraw thyself.*" The same characters are, no doubt, described in the fourth chapter of the same epistle, as; "departing from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, &c."

John in his 2nd epistle writes to the "elect lady," as follows: "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an anti-Christ. * * Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not *this doctrine*, receive him not into your house; neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." Every reader of Church history knows the characters, so fully described by both Apostles, against whom the warnings were directed. They were, according to the accounts here given of them, *heretics* and *impostors* of the *grossest kind*, and not regular and godly pastors of Christian congregations. They were regarded by the Apostles, not only, as not *Christian ministers*, but as not *Christian at all*. They were immoral in their lives, and taught the most unchristian doctrines, leading to the grossest immoralities. They are characterized, as "deceivers," *antichrist*, and "without God." Such men are found in our own day, and, by general consent, are excluded from all Lutheran pulpits, and Christian recognition.

But, to apply the Apostolic descriptions and warnings, founded upon them, to the regular and pious ministry of the Reformed Churches, would be sufficient ground for an action of slander in a court of Justice. Every community would cry out in virtuous indignation against such a defamation of character. But, if Reformed ministers do not answer to the characters of the men, described by the Apostles, from whom we are to withdraw ourselves, and whom we are not to receive into our house or bid, "God speed," then, the injunctions of the Apostles do not apply to them, can have nothing to do with the the question at issue, and must be entirely thrown out of the argument in the case.

We have now given a brief but, as we think, honest survey of the most important grounds, occupied by those who assume that it is unlawful to invite ministers of the Reformed Churches, under certain circumstances and limitations, to preach in Lutheran pulpits. Much more might be written, and other phases of the controversy examined, but as we have shown that the leading arguments used, are untenable, or not applicable to the case, we think our position is clearly established.

The propriety of inviting ministers of other denominations into our pulpits, can only be decided by the circumstances, surrounding each pastor and congregation. Perhaps, in some cases, among our German brethren, who are the leading advocates of the non-intercourse theory, it may be the best. They are separated, by language, from the leading Protestant denominations of our land, and beset on every side by those who are ready to break into their folds. We are perfectly willing that they should do their own work, in their own manner; but we protest against having their proper, local practice made a law for the whole Church, and a test of Lutheran fellowship. It is a stumbling block in the way of those who are looking for the old land-marks, and searching for the old faith. In its advocates, however conscientious they may be, it is not regarded, by the community, as an evidence of superior piety, learning, or devotion to the word of God, but rather as a remnant of that intolerant and despotic spirit that, in past ages, exiled or burned men for opinion's sake, and endeavored to bind the minds and govern the conscience, by the decrees of ecclesiastical, and civil power. Rigid denominational exclusiveness is intended as testimony for truth and righteousness; but, as it is a characteristic of the most fanatical sects, and the grossest heretics among us, it has lost all moral influence for good, and become, simply, an offence against the law of Christian brotherhood and charity. With firm adherence to God's holy word, may we always be endowed with charity towards our Christian brethren, until the differences that now separate us, shall vanish, and we shall realize, in a visible unity, the Saviour's promise of "One fold, and one Shepherd!"

ARTICLE VIII.

LIFE AND TIMES OF AMBROSE.

There is no part of the history of the ancient Church, which does not possess interest and value to the Christian. Its study, the character of its early representatives, their faults as well as their virtues, is of the highest importance. If History, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus has said, is Philosophy teaching by examples, or as Cicero tells us, the School of Life*, what more profitable exercise than to contemplate the life and labors, the sufferings and triumphs of those, whose influence on the Church and the Times in which they lived, has been generally acknowledged. And among the men, whose power was felt, no one has stronger claims upon our attention than Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, whether we consider him in his private or official character, as the earnest, energetic, practical man, the eloquent preacher, the daring prelate, the vindicator of human rights, or the recognized champion of the Church. Distinguished for his commanding talents and great abilities, his dignity, zeal and intrepidity, the fearless determination with which he discharged the duties of his office, his implacable hatred and suppression of Paganism, his stern hostility to the Arian heresy and every departure from the established faith, his uncompromising condemnation of vice, cruelty and injustice, although practiced by an emperor, and his rare executive power, his character has always awakened a deep interest and warm admiration, even in those who do not endorse all his views and practices, or fully sympathize with every measure of his administration. The story of his wonderful life, so entirely devoted to the service of the Church and the great interests of humanity, and of the age which he illustrated, regarded by many as the most splendid in the history of the ancient Church, is gathered from well-authenticated sources.

*Cicero also says: "*Nescire quid antequam natus sis acciderit, id est semper esse puerum.*"

ces, in the hope that the facts presented, may be of some interest to the general reader.

Ambrose, the noblest and the most prominent of the Latin fathers, was born in the year 340, about thirty years before the death of Athanasius, and seven years preceding the birth of Chrysostom.* His native place was Treviri (Treves). His father descended from a noble Roman family, was a distinguished military officer, holding the position of governor in Gaul, at the time one of the three grand divisions of the Western Empire. A swarm of bees, it is said, clustered around the mouth of the son, while yet an infant, asleep in the cradle, doing him no injury, which the parent interpreted as a favorable omen, indicative of future greatness and a high destiny. On the death of his father, with his mother he removed to Rome, where he was carefully instructed in a liberal education, under the direction of Probus and Symmachus, and very rapidly acquired distinction as a rhetorician. For a season he engaged in the practice of law, and his success in the profession, in connection with family influence, procured from the emperor Valentinian, his appointment, in 369, as consular governor of Northern Italy, which, at the time, included the imperial residence of Milan. On his departure from Rome to assume the duties of the office, Probus, who was a Christian, is said to have uttered to the young civilian this remarkable counsel, subsequently construed into a prediction: "Go and rule the province, not as a judge, but as a bishop!" He, at once, removed to Milan, the capital of the Occidental Empire, and speedily acquired the esteem and love of the people. Soon after his arrival at Milan, Auxentius, the leader of the Arian party in the West, who occupied the Episcopal chair, died, and there was a division in the Church, in reference to the succession. When the election was announced, and the people had convened to make choice of a bishop, the contest, in consequence of the Arian controversy, had assumed so violent a form and so formidable an aspect, that Ambrose, with the view of preventing a riot, considered it expedient to interpose the civil authority. That he might subdue angry feeling and assuage the violence of the contending parties, he repaired to the church and earnestly entreated the people to conduct the election with Christian proprie-

*Authorities differ as to the precise date of Chrysostom's birth.

ty and order. In the midst of his speech, the voice of a child was suddenly and distinctly heard, saying: "Let Ambrose be Bishop!" and before the governor had concluded his address, pronounced with so much wisdom and in so Christian a spirit, the cry was immediately adopted and welcomed by both parties, the Arian and the Athanasian, as a direction from heaven; the whole assembly, without consultation or intrigue, demanded his appointment to the vacant office, and, with united voice, and unbounded confidence, saluted him with the episcopal title. Ambrose was, however, at this time, only a catechumen in the Church, and was, therefore, not even baptized. With no ecclesiastical aspirations, regarding himself as totally unworthy of so high and important a position, and frightened at the very thought of assuming its responsible duties, he tried, by every means in his power, to decline the uncoveted dignity, to escape the importunate call of the Church. But unavailing was his remonstrance, useless his resistance, vain his flight; the will of the people, endorsed by the imperial approval, must be obeyed; it could neither be resisted nor evaded. Although he had so emphatically said, *Nolo episcopari*, he was finally compelled to yield to the public wishes, so decidedly and unequivocally expressed, and was immediately baptized. On the eighth day succeeding, in the year 374, at the age of 34, he was consecrated bishop. Ambrose, the popular governor, the wealthy patrician, so unexpectedly to himself, possessed the episcopal power of Milan. The selection gave general satisfaction. The learned and pious Basil the Great, of Cæsarea, rejoiced that God had chosen to so responsible a position, an individual in whose opinion, birth, wealth, all human acquisitions, were of little value, compared with the worth of the soul and the glory of God.

Ambrose, from this period, engages with apostolic zeal in the duties of his office. With great skill he adapts himself to the new position, and devotes himself entirely to the work. The Church is made subordinate to all other interests. He adopts, in a mild form, the ascetic spirit of the age, and spends much of his time in prayer, meditation and the examination of the Scriptures. By close application and incessant study, he is prepared to preach every Lord's Day, and frequently during the week. He disposes of his large estates, renounces his patrimony, and gives

his property to the poor. He is always accessible to the people, for whose temporal and spiritual welfare he labors with great fidelity. He uses his authority only to advance their happiness. From the very commencement of his episcopal office, he assiduously and vigorously opposed the Arians, and greatly contributed to the success of the Nicene faith and orthodox principles in the West. When the Episcopal See of Sirnium was vacant, he repaired to the city, in order to prevent the election of an Arian, and to secure the appointment of a bishop, sound in the faith. In 382, he presided over a Synod which deposed from office the bishops Palladius and Secundianus, tried and convicted of Arianism. He soon acquired great influence in the community, and, in progress of time, with the Court. By his mildness, gentleness and Christian faithfulness, he gained the confidence and regard, the love and reverence of all ranks and classes. In his difficulties with the imperial power, his character never suffered, his integrity remained unimpaired; his sincerity was never doubted. But let us follow him in his conflicts with the civil authorities, in the contest of the ecclesiastical with the imperial power.

Gratian, always a favorite with orthodox ecclesiastics, was in authority, when Ambrose, whom he loved and revered as a father, entered upon his episcopal duties, and disposed to sustain him in his measures to suppress religious error. With him he encountered no difficulty. But on his tragical death, in 383, the administration of the government, during the minority of her son Valentinian II., devolved on the empress Justina, a woman of rare beauty and great spirit, but infected with the prevailing heresy, a patroness of Arianism, and anxious to infuse into the susceptible mind of her son the same doctrinal views; with her he experienced a series of trials. The Court claimed, in the public exercise of religion, equal rights with the orthodox party and demanded the use of one of the churches in Milan for the Arian worshipers. But Ambrose peremptorily refused the imperial demand, and distinctly insisted upon the independence of the Church. His answer was courteous, but uncompromising. He fearlessly avowed his principles, asserted that the emperor was *in*, but not *over*, the Church, and that he could exercise no right over the Church property; that the palaces of the earth might belong to Cæsar, but the churches were the houses of God; that what was consecrated to

Him could not be alienated even by the bishop; and that he would rather die as a martyr to the truth than yield to the imperious proposal. The military, commissioned by the empress to take possession of the church and transfer it to the Arians, failed in their object. They found the building preoccupied by a congregation engaged, in devotional exercises, in prayer and the singing of psalms. Justina, disappointed and vexed at her failure, determined to resent the refusal, and avenge the insult. Ambrose is summoned to appear before the Court. As a faithful subject, undaunted, he obeys the royal mandate, accompanied without his permission, or consent, by a vast multitude of the people, who with impetuous zeal and daring ardor, pressed against the gates of the imperial residence. The empress, alarmed and trembling for her own safety and that of her son, instead of pronouncing upon the bishop, as anticipated, sentence of exile, humbly begs him to use his influence and authority for the protection of the young emperor and the tranquillity of the capital. The people were in full and cordial sympathy with the bishop, and the designs of the Court were signally frustrated. But the vindictive Justina could not brook defeat. The triumph of Ambrose could not be forgiven. Cherishing the wound in her relentless breast, she renews the struggle. An edict of toleration, the free exercise of religious opinion, is promulgated in all the provinces, subject to the Court of Milan. Any infringement of the imperial act was to be severely punished. The movements of the bishop are now carefully watched. A plausible pretext is soon found, and sentence of banishment is passed against him, requiring his speedy departure from the city to such place as he might select. He, however, boldly refuses compliance with the order, and his course is nobly sustained by the people who continued steadfast in their attachment to him. They guarded his person, and fortified the entrance to the church and the episcopal residence. The soldiers, unwilling to attack what seemed an impregnable position, yielded all opposition and abandoned the contest. The ecclesiastical, again, triumphs over the imperial power.

In the discharge of his duties Ambrose knew no fear. He never thought of personal danger. He never swerved from his conscientious convictions; threats could never intimidate, nor divert him from his honest purpose. When Maximus, the tyrant, sought connection with the

Church, he rejected the application, till he had passed through a due course of penitence, and made some atonement for the murder of the emperor Gratian. By his authority and eloquence the projects of the ambitious usurper were arrested, and the peace of Italy preserved.* With the same promptness and rigidity he rebukes the young Valentinian II., when he manifested a disposition to grant the petition of the Pagans in Rome, and allow them to restore their heathen altars, and sternly threatened him, if he persisted, with exclusion from the Church. "The Church," he adds, wishes no gifts from hands like thine, which have contributed to the adornment of heathen temples. Man cannot serve two masters."†

The influence, which he exerted, in the suppression and complete overthrow, of Paganism, was most remarkable. When the Roman governor, Aurelius Symmachus, urged the emperor to tolerate, in his dominions, heathen worship, and the shrines of the Pagan deities, Ambrose, with forcible and persuasive argument, opposed the application; Theodosius at once denies the request, and also, with severe punishment, prohibits the use of sacrifices and the examination of the entrails; the general practice of immolation, which essentially constituted the religion of the heathen, he declares criminal as well as infamous. "It is our will and pleasure," says the imperial edict, "that none of our subjects, whether magistrates, or private citizens, however exalted, or however humble may be their rank and condition, shall presume in any city or in any place, to worship an inanimate idol by the sacrifice of a guiltless victim." Under the same sacred influences the emperor, during his abode at Rome, even called upon the Roman Senate to declare itself in favor of the Christian religion.‡

But the most wonderful illustration in his history of ecclesiastical influence, was his contest, in 390, with Theodosius, a man of generous impulses, but of a quick and passionate temper, whom he excommunicated from the Church for the cruel massacre at Thessalonica, occasioned by a riot, when seven thousand individuals, the innocent with the guilty, indiscriminately perished. Filled with

* *Epistola XXII.*† *Epistola XVII. c. 13, 14.*‡ *Gieseler's Church History, Vol. I. 285.*

horror and anguish, the bishop would not allow him to partake of the holy communion, till he showed sincere and deep sorrow, and submitted to a public humiliation. "How wilt thou," he reproachfully inquired as he indignantly repulsed him in the vestibule of the Church and forbade him to proceed farther, "lift up in prayer the hands, still dripping with the innocent blood of the murdered? How wilt thou tread the hallowed floor, and with such hands receive the holy body of the Lord? Get thee away, and dare not to heap crime upon crime!" When the emperor, in reply, humbly referred to David's offering, the rigid bishop answered: "Well, if thou hast imitated David in sin, imitate him, also, in his repentance!"* The emperor, who had been religiously educated, felt the force of the remonstrance. He earnestly deplored his conduct and meekly submitted to the discipline of the unarmed bishop; in the church of Milan, stripped of the insignia of royalty and, with tears of penitence, publicly confessing his sin.† But he was not restored to the privileges of the Church, till eight months afterward, when he promised in future, that capital sentence should never be executed until an interval of thirty days after the signing of the death warrant, that he might have time to repent of his decision, and, if necessary, to revise the sentence and exercise mercy.‡ Theodosius then received absolution, and was allowed to enter the Church. Prostrate on the ground, weeping, smiting his forehead and tearing his hair, he exclaimed: "My soul cleaveth unto the dust. Quicken thou me, O Lord, according to thy word." At the celebration of the Eucharist he rose, and as he was accustomed to do in Constantinople, stood within the chancel. But as soon as Ambrose observed this, he sent a deacon to tell him not to intrude into the holy place, adding: "The purple may make emperors, but it cannot make priests." The em-

* *Qui sequutus es errantem, sequere corrigentem. Paulinus, Ambrosii Vita c. 24.*

† Ambrose himself describes this incident, in his funeral oration on Theodosius: *Stravit omne, quantebatur, insigne regium, deflevit in ecclesia publice peccatum suum; gemitu et lachrymis oravit veniam. Quod privati erubescunt, non erubuit imperator, publice agere penitentiam; neque ullus postea dies fuit, quo non illum doleret errorem. De Obitu Theod. c. 34. Tom. II. p. 1207.*

‡ Theodoret Hist. L. V. c. 18.

peror acknowledged that he had ignorantly transgressed, and immediately retired, giving thanks for the admonition. "I know not," says Theodoret, "which to admire more, the courage of the one, or the submission of the other." The triumph of Ambrose was complete. "Posterity," observes Gibbon, "has applauded the virtuous firmness of the archbishop, and the example of Theodosius may prove the beneficial influence of those principles which could force a monarch, exalted above the apprehension of human punishment, to respect the laws and ministers of an invisible judge." "Ambrose certainly vindicated, though not without admixture of hierarchical loftiness," says Dr. Schaff,* "the dignity and rights of the Church against the State, and the claims of Christian temperance and mercy against gross military power." And another† adds: "Thus did the Church prove, in a time of unlimited arbitrary power, the refuge of popular freedom, and saints assume the part of tribunes of the people." From this period the most amicable relations existed between the bishop and the emperor. Their intercourse was never clouded by a moment's alienation. Nothing ever occurred to impair mutual confidence. Theodosius is represented to have said publicly, in reference to Ambrose: "That he was the first man who had told him the truth, and that he was the only man whom he knew worthy to be bishop." On the occasion of his obsequies, the bishop delivered a discourse, in which, among other things, he said that the emperor, on his dying bed, was more anxious for the Church than for himself, and, in his address to the soldiers, added: "The faith of Theodosius was your victory; let your truth and faith be the strength of his sons. Where unbelief is, there is blindness, but where fidelity is, there is the host of angels."

His imperial friend, whose funeral oration he had pronounced, he survived only two years. During his final illness, all Milan was in deep sorrow; his death they felt would be the greatest calamity. When he lay on his dying bed, Stilicho, impressed with the value of his services, to Italy and to all Christendom, urged the prominent citizens of the city to implore the earnest and effective prayers of the bishop himself for his restoration to health. "I

*Church History, Vol. II. Sec. 68.

†Hase's Church History, Sec. 117.

have so lived among you," replied Ambrose, "that I cannot be ashamed to live longer, yet I am not afraid to die, for we have a good Master." He passed away peacefully and happily, closing his life in the attitude and act of prayer, April 4th 397, at the early age of fifty-seven, amid the regrets and lamentations of all, Christians, Jews and Pagans.

Augustine speaks of the bishop of Milan as the "famous preacher and most pious prelate, known to the whole world, as among the best of men," and Tillemont commends him for his "ability, wisdom and intrepidity." He was in the West what Chrysostom was in the East. These great men, although in some respects so different, yet, in others, their character and life were very similar. They resembled each other in their noble extraction, ample fortune and liberal education. Both possessed an unsullied reputation, united with indomitable energy and untiring perseverance. Both were distinguished for their eloquence; both in their views, were tinged with the growing superstition of the times, especially in reference to celibacy, the holiness of a single life, and miraculous influences. Both of them rendered important services to the State, and, at the same time, fearlessly maintained the rights and the independence of the Church, laboring with enthusiastic devotion in the work, to which they had consecrated their energies, willing to surrender life itself rather than the principles they professed.

From the narrative, briefly presented, we readily conclude that Ambrose was a man of many virtues, public and private. He had his faults, but they were the faults of the age in which he lived; many of them in other times less affected with superstition and error, he would have escaped. He was distinguished for his integrity, his manly independence, unbending firmness and dauntless courage. Neither the fear of man, nor dangers, the most appalling, could intimidate him—*justum et tenacem propositum*—or shake his firm resolve and steady purpose. His convictions of duty nothing could weaken, or destroy. This was strikingly illustrated, as we have seen, in his inflexible determination to resist what he considered the encroachments of the imperial power on the rights of the Church, in his heroic refusal to concede to the Arians the use of an edifice for heretical worship, although demanded by a cruel empress; and was still more signally displayed

in his prompt discipline of the great but despotic Theodosius. He was also remarkable for his humility and fervor, his affability and gentleness, his generosity and noble beneficence. He labored,

"Profuse of toil, and prodigal of health,"

to alleviate human wretchedness, to mitigate the horrors of war, and diminish the evils of slavery. The ornaments of the churches, even the consecrated vessels, were freely* disposed of by him for the redemption of captives, sold in the public market. "The Church," he says, "possesses gold, not to treasure up, but to distribute for the welfare and happiness of man. It is not merely the lives of men and the honor of women, which are imperiled, but the faith of their children."† He was the kind friend of the poor, the faithful protector of the suffering and the fearless vindicator of the oppressed, unwearied in his efforts to do good, and uncompromising in his opposition to Paganism and Arianism. He was eminent, *facile princeps*, in administrative ability. In his youth he became thoroughly acquainted with the business of the State, and was thus fitted for executive duty in the Church. His episcopal office he filled with great zeal and discretion; it was generally conceded, with the highest dignity and skill. His labors were immense, his duties manifold, yet they were all faithfully and successfully performed.

This distinguished prelate rendered great service to the Church of his day in the improvement of its poetry and music.‡ He introduced into the exercises of the sanctuary the responsive, or choral singing of psalms and hymns, in which there are frequent references to the Trinity, a constant recognition of the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, a doctrine denied by the Arians, and for which he so earnestly contended. He was regarded as the Father of Hymnology in the Western Church, and the *Ambrosianus Ritus* has taken its name from him, either because he is the author of the Ritual, or introduced into it important changes.§ The effect of the service in the

*Kurtz's Church History, Vol. I. § 47.

†*De Officiis Ministrorum*, c. 28. *Epistola in Symmachum*, II.

‡Paulinus, *Vita Amb.* c. 13.

§By some the Ritual, in its original form, has been ascribed to Barnabas. Additions were subsequently made by Simplicianus.

large cathedral of Milan, is described by those who heard it in the strongest, most enthusiastic language, as greatly superior for "melody, modulation, aptness and simplicity," to any thing previously known. "The voices," says Augustine, "sank into my ears, and the truths distilled into my heart, whence the affection of my devotions overflowed; tears ran down, and I rejoiced in them," At the same time he expresses the apprehension, "that the sweetness of the music might captivate the senses, and weaken the influence of the truth on the mind."

In the renowned bishop of Milan the ecclesiastical power assumed a character, hitherto unclaimed. With him the superiority of the spiritual, over the temporal, authority, the subordination of the throne to the altar, was a fundamental maxim of Christianity. He thought that every measure of the civil government should be closely identified with the interests of religion and the glory of God.* He was the first who fearlessly claimed for the Church those exalted and extraordinary pretensions, which are so important in a hierarchy and so essential to the very existence of the Romish system, and yet so oppressive to the conscience of the individual and destructive of Christian liberty. To the immense influence, which he wielded, the development of the papal power may be traced, and papal imperiousness ascribed. His administration forms, in many points, a transition period in the history of the Church. It served to prepare the way for Hildebrand's subsequent aggressions, and furnished the bishop of Rome, seven hundred years later, with a pretext for placing his foot on the neck of princes and for bringing the world in subjection to the power of the crosier.

He was the warm admirer and zealous promoter, in accordance with the prevalent ascetic tendencies, of the monastic system.† He established a monastery in Milan, one of the earliest in Italy,‡ and his sister Marcellina was one of the first, among Roman women, to devote herself to a life of celibacy. The monastic life in the Latin Church assumed, however, a milder form than in the Eastern. There was the usual austerity connected with the system,

*Gibbon's Roman Empire, Vol. II. p. 174.

†Gieseler's Church History, Vol. I. § 96.

‡Augustini Confess. L. VIII. c. 6.

yet none of its inactive and contemplative reclusiveness, and less of the extravagances of asceticism.

He cordially believed and earnestly adopted the doctrine of Mary's perpetual virginity. In the fourth century this dogma was already an article of faith. Ambrose maintained that the name *perpetua virgo* was to be received, not merely in a moral, but in a physical* sense, and that the Saviour was miraculously conceived and supernaturally produced *clauso utero*, applying typically to Mary the passage (in Ezek. 44 : 2): "The gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut."†

He also favored the worship of saints. He was one of the earliest and most decided advocates of the practice. "Let Peter," he says, "who effectively wept for himself, weep also for us, and turn upon us the friendly look of Christ."‡ Again he remarks: "The angels, who have been appointed as a guard for us, must be invoked; the martyrs, whose certain intercession we seem to claim, by the pledge of their bodies, must be invoked. * * * For they are martyrs of God, our high-priests, spectators of our life and our acts."§ He also countenanced and encouraged the worship of relics, which became, in the course of time, so important an element of the Catholic religion. "Let others," he says, "heap up silver and gold; we gather the nails wherewith the martyrs were pierced, and their victorious blood, and the wood of their cross." In a letter to his sister,|| he speaks of the discovery of the bones of the

* *Epistola ad Siricum*, 42.

† *Quæ est hæc porta, nisi Maria? Ideo clausa quia virgo. Porta igitur Maria, per quam Christus intravit in hunc mundum, Opera de inst. Virg. Tom. II. c. 8.*

‡ *Fleat pro nobis Petrus, qui pro se bene flevit, et in nos pia Christi ora convertat. Hexæm. cap. 25.*

§ *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli pro nobis, qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt; Martyres obsecrandi, quorum videmur nobis quoddam, corporis pignore, patrocinium vindicare. Isti enim sunt Dei martyres, nostri præsules, speculatores vitæ, actuumque nostrorum. De Viduis, c. 9, §55.*

|| *Epist. Sorori suæ XXII.*

brothers Gervasius and Protasius, buried upwards of three hundred years, victims of the bloody persecutions under the emperors Nero, or Domitian, which exercised healing power, and, as they were borne, in solemn procession, on the way, restored the vision of a blind man. In one of his homilies he vindicates the miracle, in opposition to the doubts of the Arians, and refers to it as an acknowledged and undisputed fact. "The age of miracles," he says, "returned. Pieces of linen, and portions of dress were cast upon the holy relics, and were invested with the power of healing from the tomb itself."* He was deeply imbued with the superstitious spirit of his times. Popular belief also ascribed to him miraculous influences and supernatural power, in proof of which Paulinus furnishes his own experience together with additional evidence from others. And, whilst Ambrose did not exactly encourage this religious credulity, he did not entirely discountenance the claim. How often do we find in history a repetition of the fact, that where great and unlimited power has been committed to the ministry, the idea of supernatural influences is unscrupulously asserted, and the power often openly claimed.

Ambrose, even in a good cause, in his desire to promote soundness of faith, sometimes exhibited an intolerance, not the mild influences of religion, toward those who differed from him in opinion. The precepts and maxims inculcated and enforced by him, were also used by the imperial power in justification of the persecution, of which they were often guilty towards heretics, Jews and Pagans.† This was forcibly exemplified in the intolerant spirit of the laws enacted by Theodosius and executed with the

*"When they were discovered and dug up, and with due honor conveyed to the *Ambrosiana Basilica*, not only they who were vexed with unclean spirits were cured, but a certain man, who had for many years been blind, a citizen well known to the city, asking and hearing the reason of the people's confused joy, sprang forth, desiring his guide to lead him thither. Led thither, he begged to be allowed to touch with his handkerchief the bier of Thy saints, whose death is precious in Thy sight. Which when he had done, and put to his eyes, they were forthwith opened."—*Confessions of Augustine*, L. IX. c. 7.

†Epistola XXIV.

unanimous applause of the Christian world.* The people who regarded their bishop with so much reverence and enthusiastic devotion, were easily persuaded that "the bare toleration of heresy was persecution of the true faith."†

As a theologian and an author, Ambrose does not hold so high a rank as some others; he is not so able as Jerome, his cotemporary, or Augustine, his pupil. Perhaps, the opinions expressed among critics with regard to his merits as a writer, are more conflicting than in reference to any of the other fathers in the ancient Church. Jerome speaks of his exegetical productions in the most disparaging terms, comparing his Commentary on Luke to the croaking of a raven, which makes sport of the colors of all other birds, and is itself all over dark—*totus ipse tenebrosus*. Gibbon pronounces his compositions destitute of genius and taste. Augustine, the accomplished scholar, on the other hand, speaks of him, as a writer with the most enthusiastic admiration. Schaff, a man of great erudition, says: "That in the writings of Ambrose, old Roman vigor, dignity and sententiousness, are united with a deep and ardent practical Christianity."

The productions of Ambrose are numerous and varied. They consist of homilies, orations and letters, also of exegetical, doctrinal and miscellaneous contributions. His exegetical writings are of less value, because he introduces into his interpretations so much allegory and mystic subtlety, so many "fantastic analogies" and "latent significations." Sixty-three sermons have been ascribed to him,‡ a Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, an Exposition of Twenty-one Psalms, Homilies on the History of Creation (*Hexæmeron*). Among his doctrinal writings, his discussions on Faith, the Holy Ghost, and the Sacraments, have been most commended. Of his ethical productions, his work on Duties (*Libri Tres de Officiis Ministrorum*) is the most important. It resembles Cicero's treatise on Duties (*De Officiis*) which he evidently desired to imitate, reproduced in a Christian spirit, and furnishing clergymen ethical rules for their guidance.§ He also wrote several

*Milman Hist of Christianity, Vol. III. p. 166.

†Lea's Studies in Church History, p. 272.

‡*Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*. Vol. VII. p. 603.

§"The ideas of the pastoral office," says Dr. Milner, "were in Am-

works on the ascetic life, which exerted a wide influence in the interests of celibacy and monastic piety. Ninety of his letters have also been preserved, some of which are of great historical value. He also wrote a number of hymns, some of the noblest of the Latin Church,* full of faith, simplicity and unction.† Eighty-two have been ascribed to him, but, by some authorities, only ten, or twelve, are considered genuine, the rest being imitations by anonymous writers. He is generally regarded as the author of the *Te Deum Laudamus*, although many assign its composition to a later period in the Church. His hymns are generally in iambic verse, and in the Latin tongue, which was then the spoken language of the country.

The last edition of Ambrose's works is the Benedictine, published in Paris, in 1686-90, in two folio volumes, under the title: *Opera ad manuscriptos codices Vaticanos, Gallicanos, Belgicos, etc. Necnon ad editiones veteres emendata studio monachorum ordinis Benedicti*. Appended to the volumes are his Memoirs, written at the request of Augustine, by Paulinus, a deacon in the Church at Milan, and the secretary of the bishop, together with the biographical sketches of Ambrose, by Tillemont, Hermant and others.

The Life of this distinguished Bishop, in the early history of the Church, is rich in instruction. It is highly suggestive. From its study many useful lessons may be learned. In good men, whose piety cannot be questioned, there are often serious imperfections and errors. Even with an ardent zeal for pure doctrine, there may be asso-

brose exceedingly serious, meek, lowly and devotional. Have we not, too generally, great occasion to be humbled, on comparing ourselves with this holy servant of God?"—*Church History*, Vol. I. p. 353.

*Archbishop Trench thinks, that he sees in these hymns, "a rock-like firmness, the old Roman stoicism transmuted into that nobler Christian courage, which encountered and, at length, overcame, the world."

†His *Veni, Redemptor Gentium*, written by him during the year of his death, has been much admired. It has been freely rendered into German by Luther and others. It has, also, been repeatedly reproduced in English. Rev. Dr. Palmer's translation is, perhaps, the finest, found in Dr. Schaff's "Christ in Song."

ciated great human infirmities. A man may earnestly contend for the faith, and yet be sadly wanting in some of the cardinal virtues of Christian character. We have no right to assume that God's servants are so infallible as never to make mistakes. They may be narrow and impracticable in their views, intolerant and bitter in spirit, deficient in humility, meekness and love. They may be proscriptive and exacting as to the "mint and anise and cummin," whilst "they have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith." Scarred and seamed as we all are by sin, it is only at the cross we fully realize how imperfect we are, and how in Christ alone there is perfection and safety.

The progress of error is gradual. The love of power, selfishness and ambition, an overbearing and arrogant spirit, may slowly and imperceptibly invade the sacred enclosures of the Church, long before the fatal tendency is seen, or the danger felt. If the Church, during its past history, had always confined itself to its legitimate and appropriate work of simply preaching the gospel, if it had been less eager to grasp and exercise power, vastly different to-day would be the condition of the world.

No human being, however excellent his character, or prominent his position, is necessarily a sure, unerring guide in matters pertaining to faith and practice. The teachings of the Fathers and the writings of the Reformers, however valuable their instruction and inspiring their influence, are not absolute authority. They are merely human productions. Scripture alone is given by inspiration. Whilst the Church may gather wisdom even from her ignorance, strength from her failures and victory from her defeats, God's inspired word is our only safe directory, and the spotless example of the Son of God, our only infallible guide.

And we learn, notwithstanding the imperfections and aberrations of men, human combinations, evil purposes and dark designs, the rubbish, in successive ages, heaped upon the Church, it is safe. "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper." The powers of darkness, the opposition of men, the enemies of the Church, the direst foe of God and man, will all prove unavailing. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The battle may be long and fearful, but, in every contest, the Church will triumph. From every assault it will rise, not only with

unimpaired energies, but with renewed strength and increased responsibilities. Changes may come, dynasties rise and fall, revolution succeed revolution, but the Church will survive. Truth will everywhere overthrow error and virtue supplant vice. There is a kingdom on earth, which is to outlive all kingdoms. The power that guards it, is to lead it on to final and complete success. "God is our refuge and strength. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed. God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved." Let the Church rejoice. Let the whole earth vibrate with the Jubilee of heaven: "Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"

ARTICLE IX.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

By H. L. BAUGHER, D. D., Late President of Pennsylvania College.*

At the close of the eventful and melancholy drama of the Saviour's life, these words—"My kingdom is not of this world"—were uttered. He was standing as a criminal before the Roman Governor. His own people had condemned him, and now with unabated malice they seek his condemnation and death from the power which alone could decree the penalty of death. Charged with the crime of being a king, and the king of the Jews, as if in solemn mockery, his reply is "*My kingdom is not of this world*: if my kingdom were of this

*This was the last Discourse written by President Baugher, and was, of course, not designed for publication. It was never delivered. Before it was the author's turn again to preach, he had gone from the toils of earth to the rewards of Heaven. The Discourse is now given to the readers of the *Review*, many of whom, for years, listened with interest and profit to the Doctor's earnest and pungent appeals from the Pulpit of the College Church, with the sincere hope that it may accomplish the object for which it was prepared, and the author being dead, may yet speak for the Master. The Discourse is from the words: "Jesus answered, *My kingdom is not of this world.*" John 18 : 36.

EDITOR.

world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence." Our theme then is THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST: which we propose to discuss, 1. As to its Nature. 2. Its Progress 3. Its Consummation.

I. *Its Nature.* At once the Saviour declares that it is not of this world. The world had no part in him. On the contrary his kingdom is taken out of the world and his people are separated from it, that they may be a peculiar people, zealous of good works. What fellowship has light with darkness, Christ with Belial or the people of God with the people of the world? No antagonism can be stronger or more persistent and continued than that which subsists between Christ and the world. It is unlike all worldly kingdoms in its *spirit*. "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," is the language of the Saviour. The servants of other kingdoms, fight for their kings and rulers with carnal weapons, to defend themselves, and to destroy others. My servants do not thus fight, for my kingdom is not from hence. The servants of Christ do, indeed, contend, but not with flesh and blood, nor by means of sword and spear, but with principalities and powers, with spiritual wickedness in high places, with their own depraved natures, with every secret impulse to evil within the soul and the temptations which the world from without addresses to the soul. Its spirit is not warlike but peaceful, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and of good fruits. Its victories over its enemies are achieved not by hatred and ill-will but by benevolence and kindness, oftentimes by suffering innocently for the truth, or by suffering on behalf of others; for in this way Christ achieved his great victories over his great enemy, by dying on the cross. It is not like the kingdoms of this world in its *form*. The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. There is no parade of military or civic pomp; no long and stately processions; no courtly robes or emblazoned heralding; no firing of cannon or flash of arms, or flaring sashes and batons of authority. There is no visible King or Emperor or President, no form of monarchy or aristocracy or democracy. It manifests itself under every form of government, is suited to all people, all governments, all conditions, all colors and all climates. Nevertheless it comes with mighty and resistless power. The

strong and the learned, the brave, mighty conquerors and celebrated warriors, the philosopher, the poet, the scholar, all yield to its power. It subdues the inner man, taking captive the understanding and the affections and the will, and the outer man with all his powers and possessions follows in the train of the conqueror. In vain then do men teach that Christ will establish a kingdom on the earth, visible in form, and in this respect like the kingdoms of this world. Form in its present state does not belong to the nature of Christ's kingdom, nor would it contribute to its progress and development, nor have we any warrant in the word of God, by implication or specific declaration, to believe it. Yet more inconsistent with the history of this kingdom, in the past and its progress until this day, is the assumption that Christ will appear in person, having his palace and capitol city, and reign on the earth, and, like the kingdoms of this world, subdue his enemies under him. It is not like the kingdoms of this world in its *aim or object*. The world and the kingdoms and nations which compose it, are *selfish*. The great aim and object is some personal or national advantage over others. Some territory, some occupation, some source of wealth and power which I want, and which you must not have. History, from its earliest records until now, teaches only one or two great truths concerning the kingdoms of this world: They sought to exalt themselves by the ruin of their neighbors; the path of the conqueror was covered over with destruction and misery; before him was peace, prosperity, and plenty, behind him, death, ruin, want and woe; before him was as the garden of Eden, behind him the desert whitened with dead men's bones, and blackened with the remains of burned cities and villages. The earth under the rule of the kingdoms of this world is but one extended Aceldama. To accomplish all this ruin in the outer man, there must be the development of the ruin of the inner man. The depravity of man's nature exhibited every form of vice and crime, falsehood, perjury, fraud, cruelty, licentiousness, ambition, pride, alienation from God, blasphemy, idolatry, anger, wrath, malice, &c. After the age of physical force had partially passed away, with the increase of intelligence, and, in the lull of the battle-storm, diplomacy was employed, the aim of the representatives of the respective kingdoms was by bribery,

falsehood, perjury and fraud to obtain the advantage over the others, so that whilst the earth is one vast battle-field fought over and over again by the successive kingdoms of this world by brute force, the history of the pacific intercourse of the same kingdoms is a record of deception and bribery and falsehood in all its forms. Genius, and learning, and the sanctity of the priesthood, with which only holy thoughts should be associated, were only the instruments, by which the ends of justice and truth might be most successfully defeated. Now the kingdom of Christ aims at the removal and complete destruction of all these things. It aims to banish from the earth all ungodliness and unrighteousness and just in the degree in which it prevails and takes possession of the hearts of men, in that degree will wickedness in all its forms disappear from the earth. It is animated by the spirit of pure love, or disinterested benevolence, even as was its divine Founder and King when he came to save a ruined world by the sacrifice of himself. Thus reads the record: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." If we ask for a definite expression of the ends aimed at by this kingdom, I reply, the glory of God and the salvation of man. All its plans and purposes, all its active agencies, whether intellectual or physical, have this in view, and all its results, however the means in the view of short sighted man are aimless and inadequate, terminate inevitably in these.

If we were to characterize this kingdom briefly, we would say 1. That it is *Righteous*, seeking not only to do right, but to lead others to do right, making known the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus, that the erring and lost might find a righteousness not of their own, by which they can come with acceptance before God. It makes God known as he was not known before, not merely in the displays of his power and wisdom and goodness, but in human nature in his Son Jesus Christ, the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person. It restores the forgotten knowledge of God, and reveals him in a new and most endearing aspect, as condescending to our infirmity and laying down his life for us. Moreover it discloses the rule of right, by which men must be guided, in their intercourse with each other, and in their duties to God. 2. It is *Good*. It aims only at good and not at

evil, and, knowing what is best for its subjects, it secures for them the highest good. It suffers persecution but never persecutes. Its subjects are exposed to harm and danger, to the loss of property and life; it never inflicts these upon others, whilst it makes the evils which are inflicted upon its subjects to eventuate in their ultimate good. 3. It is *Truthful*. Its promises and threatenings will all be fulfilled, for he who has made them has all power given to him in heaven and on earth and bears the name of *faithful and true*.

II. We come to consider the progress, or development of this kingdom. 1. *It is slow*. All the great movements of God are slow. His *creation*, as the facts in Geology disclose it, is wondrous slow. We cannot tell the ages which are written on the various strata of rocks and the countless generations of animals which lived and perished on it, in order to make it a habitation suitable for the dwelling place of man. The plan of *Redemption* was slow in its development to man. At first, faint streaks of light in the darkness, giving proof of the coming light, and these centuries before the dawn of the day which ushered into our world the Sun of Righteousness. As the mercy of God was slow in bringing the light to a ruined world, so the *Justice* of God is slow and waiting long on the wicked to turn and live. It is reasonable to suppose that the same deliberation will be employed in the continued progress and consummation of it.

2. It is *persistent*. It takes no step backward and withdraws not the word spoken. It is not yea and nay, but yea and Amen. The forces of nature move forward slowly and resistlessly to the end. Why should they not? What is to hinder or divert? Are they not founded on the purposes of God which never change. So is his moral government, like the natural, fixed and unchangeable, and based upon the perfections of his character, which are pledged for its consummation. *Great principles* never move backwards. The world has not lost one of the great truths made known by Revelation, or developed in the collision of mind or the providence of God. The great principle of civil and religious liberty, struggling as it has been for many centuries into definite existence, could never be lost. Spain, France and Austria made the effort at the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives, and unheard of cruelties, and they could not exterminate

it, either from the swamps of Holland, or the mountains of Savoy. Though the men died under inquisitorial torture, the principle lived and no power of man, or of Demon is able to destroy it. The great facts of the Christian system, are imperishable. The plan of Redemption cannot die. The foundation of the kingdom of Christ, Justice, Goodness, Truth, can never be destroyed.' These principles may be overridden, for a season, by powerful and unscrupulous men; or the sword and the rack, and the stake and the inquisition, in the hands of an ignorant and superstitious monarch, may crush them to earth for a season, as in Spain, and in the Netherlands, but they will rise again and vindicate their rights before the nations of the earth. As illustrating the slow and persistent movement of this kingdom, we must consider the instrumentality which is employed. As I have already intimated, not armies and fleets, not war and destruction, not falsehood and fraud, but *simple truth* is the power used. Man is made acquainted with himself and with his God. He is brought face to face with the law of God, which is exceeding broad, with that word which, accompanied by the spirit, is living, powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, and pierces to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. The process is to convince of sin, its power, pollution and fearful consequences, and thus prepare the way for the offers of mercy through the blood of Christ. Thus slowly and surely, without pomp or display, in the inner strife of the man, the understanding is convinced, and the affections are secured on the side of truth, and then the whole man, body and soul, with all his influence of knowledge and talent and wealth, enrolls himself a follower of the King of kings. From the one individual the power of the truth passes over to another, each conquest making a soldier of the kingdom, until the mass is subdued. Thus the power passes from one kingdom and nation to another, until the waves of knowledge have rolled over our ruined world. The agencies are as various and multiform as are the resources of the Great King. It was said that this kingdom relied not upon wars or physical force, but upon the truth. At the same time, it controls the wars of nations, and the prided arrogance of princes and men in power for the development of its own mighty power for good. The wars of the Jews and their seventy years of captivity destroyed their

idolatrous propensity and revealed to their captors the true God. The conquests of Cyrus and Alexander the Great, and the establishment of the Roman empire on their ruins, prepared the way for the closing of the temple of Janus and the universal peace which ushered in the advent of the Prince of Peace. The world stood still in silent awe and expectation when he took upon him our nature, who was to rule the nations with a rod of iron and subdue all his enemies unto himself. Thus was the mighty Roman Empire broken to pieces and ground to powder, that it might be made tributary to the development of this new and everlasting Kingdom. Thus will all modern kingdoms and nations be overthrown which stand in the way of the triumphs of him who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. Moreover this kingdom operates and make progress through the agency of the press, of schools, of the pulpit, of laws, of conversation and the contact of man with man. Included in these are discoveries in science and art, geography, geology, astronomy, statistics, travels, manners, customs, antiquities; all is made tributary to the development of this great kingdom which is, and is to be, the glory of earth. As an illustration of the kind of agency last mentioned, the discovery of the art of printing and the power of steam, has opened the world and brought the distant parts together as they never were before. With the diffusion of Christian knowledge by the establishment of Christian schools and the formation of a Christian literature, the forms of government and the laws of Pagan and Mohammedan countries will be changed, and those belonging to Christian nations will be improved. Already have the pioneers of this kingdom penetrated into their outposts and given to them a written language, Christian schools, literature. Already the light of the Sun of Righteousness is gilding the tops of the mountains in Asia and Africa and the distant Islands of the sea, and its life-giving light is penetrating the jungle, and deep valleys of sin which are full of the habitations of cruelty. Soon, in the mind of God, will the cheering words be heard: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ."

III. Under the influence of powers, known and unknown, and under the direction of infinite wisdom, this kingdom is moving forward towards its grand consummation. The forces which produce the terrible earthquake,

which engulf cities and mountains, and rend asunder the solid earth and shake it to its foundations, are forming and concentrating, and are unperceived, until the terrible catastrophe is produced; so the energies of this kingdom are developing, unperceived by the world, and then, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the Son of Man will come. The Saviour himself informs us that the world will go forward in its ordinary routine of business and pleasure, unconscious of any change, unsuspecting of any evil. In the meanwhile righteousness and goodness and truth, the gospel of God's grace, will so prevail and predominate in all lands, as to give them the mastery. The work begun eighteen hundred years ago, will spread itself like the light and the heat, until the earth will be filled with the knowledge of God. "Then will come the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." The last act in this eventful drama, is the Judgment, when the final separation will be made between the righteous and the wicked, and each one will receive according to the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or bad. Then the work of Christ will have been accomplished. He that is holy, will be holy still, and he that is filthy, will be filthy still. There will then be no need of mediation, of a preached gospel, of the means of grace. The work, for which the Son of God came from heaven to earth, is completed. All who believed in the Son of God are saved, all who remained in unbelief are damned. Having finished the work which God gave him to do, the Son now is subject to the Father, that God may be all and in all. Glorious consummation! wonderful display of the character of God! How wonderful are his works and his ways past finding out! "For of him and through him and to him, are all things, to whom be glory forever and ever."

1. When we reflect upon the nature and blessedness of this kingdom, the reflection arises in the mind spontaneously, how desirable the establishment of its overriding influence over every earthly kingdom! We see its power and its blessedness, wherever Christ is known as the Saviour of sinners. Its power is the power of righteousness, goodness and truth. It is seen in the benevolence which

pervades the Christian Church, in the integrity and uprightness of Christian men, in public and private charities, in laws founded on justice and mercy. It is found in the ministry, and their efforts to make known among all men the knowledge of the way of salvation through Christ. It is found in Christian Schools and Colleges. Sometimes you will find it almost unmixed with evil, in a household where the love of Jesus reigns supreme, and the one great thought and governing purpose is, to glorify his name and to become like him; where all other affections and desires are subordinated to this one, and the highest welfare of each is subordinated to that of the whole, and where self is lost in the desire and the effort to benefit all. This is heaven on earth, the beginning of that state in which there shall be no sin, but where peace and joy in the Holy Ghost shall reign forever.

2. In view of the blessedness of this kingdom, it is our duty to advance its interests by all the means in our power. This we will do, first by becoming members of it, by giving our hearts, our obedience, to its Great King, and becoming his followers. In no way can we more successfully honor Christ than by confessing him before men. In no way do we dishonor him more, than by denying him before men. This we do when we live in sin, resist the truth and Spirit, and, in general, make manifest that we are unwilling to believe in him, or to serve him. Secondly, we advance the interests of this kingdom, when we bring others, the enemies of Christ, into it, when we multiply and send out copies of the sacred Scriptures, a sacred literature, a holy ministry, when we establish Schools and Colleges under Christian influences; when, in a word, we make known to the ends of the earth, the salvation of our God.

Now we ought to do this for Christ's sake, who has loved us and given himself for us. We ought to do it for our own sakes, because in no other way can we be saved. There is no salvation out of Christ; no salvation out of this kingdom. He who does not humble himself before this King of kings and accept his proffered mercy, will perish. There is no name under heaven by which we must be saved, but the name of Christ. We ought to do it for the sake of our friends and relatives, that they may be influenced by us to come to Jesus. We ought to do it for the sake of a ruined world, that men everywhere may

be delivered from the depravity and cruelty of heathenism, from the power of sin and Satan, and be made free and happy in Christ. Motives such as these should continually animate us.

ARTICLE X.

MARTIN STEPHAN AND THE STEPHANITES.* TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF JOHN B. KUMMER, D. D., PASTOR OF THE BOHEMIAN CONGREGATION IN DRESDEN.†

The name of Stephan is connected with too important and far-reaching a movement in the Church history of our time, not to deserve a place here. The obscurity which surrounds many events of his life until this day, the mysterious character of the man, and the fact that the sources of his history were rarely influenced by partisan feelings, made it a very desirable privilege for the author of this article, that he was permitted to consult the official docu-

**Vide* Herzog's *Encycl.* Vol. XV. 41-61.

†The object of the reproduction of this article in English, at this time, is, to give the readers of this *Review* the benefit of the clear and important light which it throws upon the mostly unknown origin, early history, and real attitude and animus of a class of co-religionists among us, much praised by some, and much censured by others. We refer to those who are best known by the name of MISSOURI LUTHERANS—a body which has now become large and influential in some sections of the country, particularly among the German population. Some of their most distinguished leaders are named in the article, which fully, impartially and authentically explains under what circumstances and to what intent they came among us. The history, we are sure, is a very different one from what is generally supposed, and it gives the true and natural key to the right understanding of some of the more marked and extraordinary characteristics of a body, with which the Lutheran Church, in general, has, and will have, more or less to do. It is but just, therefore, that it should be known whence they sprang, how they came hither, and what the nature is of that root, from which they have grown and derived their life.

ments of ecclesiastical and secular authorities, even of the courts, as also many oral communications from his own Bohemian and Stephan's so-called congregation, and, finally, notices and criticisms of impartial, competent men and women.

MARTIN STEPHAN was born at Strausberg, Moravia, August 13, 1777. His poor, but pious parents, were originally Roman Catholics. The father, a weaver, became a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in consequence of diligent reading in the Bible, while the mother, with the children, remained Catholic, threatened as she was by her priest, "that the devil incarnate would take her, if she would touch the Bible or any Lutheran book." Afterwards, however, as this dreaded event did not come to pass, she also joined the Lutheran Church. Whether Martin and one of his sisters, at the same time, or only later, inclined to the evangelical faith, I have not ascertained. His father destined him for his own trade, but, with his pietistic tendency, he took particular care of his Christian education, so that Martin, already in early youth, became pretty familiar with the Bible; his mother especially accustomed him, from tender childhood, to prayer and implanted the seeds of godliness in his heart. She, whom he always mentioned with filial piety, taught him the following morning and evening prayer: "I thank thee, God Father, that thou hast created me; I thank thee, God Son, that thou hast redeemed me; I thank thee, God Holy Ghost, that thou hast sanctified me." But as both his parents died already at an early period, he spent his childhood and youth in sorrow and want, and under the Austrian "edict of toleration," (*Toleranz edict*). His education was, under these circumstances, a very limited one. In his twenty-first year he came, as a journeyman-weaver, to Breslau, after having been subjected at home to the persecution of the Catholics; he afterwards spoke of this time as follows: "When I was compelled to flee from home with my sister, we heard already the iron chains clanking behind us." In Breslau he immediately joined the Pietists ("*Erweckten*") and attended their devotional meetings, indulging in polemics already at that time with an inflexible mind and an imperious character. With the ardent desire of the newly, awakened to preach the salvation also to others, and supported by Christian philanthropists, he entered, in the year 1802, the Elizabeth Gymnasium at Breslau, where

Rutor, the father of the well-known Prof. Scheibel, aided him likewise with his advice and efficient help. He was already then very familiar with the German Bible, since he had improved even the nights for reading the Scriptures as well as other religious books. At the age of twenty-five years, a member of the fourth form ("Quarta") he naturally had to encounter a great deal of ridicule on the part of his younger school-fellows, which to be sure was partly repressed by his extraordinary strength and size (he measured six feet three inches), but which, nevertheless, contributed towards, more and more, confirming him in his natural bitterness, asperity and imperiousness, as also in his strong self-reliance. In spite of his strong will, he was unable to retrieve what he had neglected, and more on account of his age than of his maturity (*propter staturam plus quam propter studii industriam*), he gradually advanced to the first form ("Prima"), where the office of "economist" (amanuensis of the Rector) gave him a sort of legal authority over his fellow-students, which he not unfrequently, with arbitrary tyranny, extended beyond its proper bounds. At that time he is said to have procured for himself an old gown, and to have preached in a loud voice for hours in his cell. After having learned only the most necessary Latin, and much less Greek, he entered, in 1804, the University of Halle, still aided by support which he received from Breslau, and, after an interruption, from 1806—1809, the University of Leipsic where he attended some philosophical and theological lectures, without making great progress in the learned studies, which he rejected as "carnal sciences." In everything that did not date from antiquity, he discovered infidelity or heterodoxy. Here, too, his principal studies were devoted to the ascetics, especially from the period of Spener and Francke. His dogmatic theology he owed, next to the symbolical writings, to Freylinghausen's fundamental theology ("*Grundlegungs Theologie*"), his knowledge of homiletics to Scriber's "Seelenschatz" (Treasury of the soul). Of ecclesiastical history he had a thorough, though one-sided, knowledge, which he also knew how skilfully to apply to instruction or conversation. With such a limited study and knowledge, he became, to be sure, so much the more master of what he acquired. The deficient extent of his knowledge was made good by its in-

tensity, to which a good memory and a great amount of serious experience was added. Thus his sermons and conversations were never tedious. Stephan had hardly finished his studies, he received—although not venturing to submit to the examination “pro-candidature,” with regard to his knowledge of the Moravian and Bohemian language—a call as pastor to Haber, in Bohemia, and after one year spent in this “school of abstinence,” another call as pastor of the Bohemian congregation of exiles (“*Exulanten gemeinde*”) and German preacher at St. John’s church in Dresden (1810), mainly through the vigorous intercession of the court-chaplain, Dr. Doering, since he then was considered a Moravian (“*Herrnhuter*”). His entrance-sermon, on Rom. 1: 16 sq.: “I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ,” &c., he delivered on Palm Sunday. The examination had to be carried on, for the most part, in German, by Drs. Reinhard and Tittmann, and they paid especial regard to his “Christian disposition and practical talents.” He had declined a call to Rochsburg as court-chaplain. In Dresden his sermons, in which the strict Lutheran-biblical spirit prevailed, met immediately with great approval on the part of the small number of susceptible persons, and, before long, a large audience gathered around him at the German service, while the Bohemian congregation, at that time, numbered hardly more than three hundred members. Besides he continued, in the manner of Spener, the devotional exercises, “which had been kept up for nearly half a century, by all (?) his predecessors, especially by Pastor M. Petermann.” It seems that these were, at first, mainly frequented by the Moravians. Every fortnight Pastor Stephan instituted on Sunday evening, after singing and prayer, a “recapitulation of the sermon” (“*Bedietrichderholung*”); on the alternate Sundays he had a sermon read; Mondays and Fridays, from 8—10 P. M. there were devotional exercises; on the first Monday of every month there was “conversation” (“*sprechstunde*”) for men, to which, however, also boys were admitted; every third Monday “general conversation,” for both men and women; on the intermediate Mondays there was reading of sermons, selected by Stephan, e. g., Arndt’s sermons on the Catechism, sometimes also of missionary reports. Stephan himself was generally not present on these occasions. To keep up order, he appointed superintendents. During the “conversations” which, however, were instituted only at a later

time (about 1830?), to gratify the wants of the many in search of advice and instruction, every member was entitled to anonymously write down questions regarding matters of faith and conscience, as also domestic affairs, and deposit them into a box, or to orally propound them; and the pastor afterwards answered these questions, generally with great precaution, pastoral wisdom and rare knowledge of human nature. On Friday evenings there was a *Bible-lesson* for both sexes, when the Bible was read, chapter by chapter, together with the Tübingen Summaries; these, too, were seldom attended by Stephan himself. When, during these devotional exercises, any prayers were said, they had always to be *read* by the laymen, as he did not allow any free, extemporaneous prayers on these occasions.

We had to give these details regarding these "*Erbauungsstunden*" (hours of devotion), because first, they, which were generally called "conventicles," and as such suspicious and suspected, soon prejudiced both the educated and uneducated against Stephan, while they likewise formed the means, by which his disciples more and more firmly and personally were attached to him.

But what secured to Stephan, in so short a time, such a number of followers, "aside of his vigorous, tall, though somewhat clumsy form, he possessed *nothing* that could have attracted the world—neither declamatory nor gesticulatory excellence, nor fiery or fluent eloquence, nor a pure pronunciation, nor any (artistic) skill in the arrangement of his sermons, nor any rhetorical aid whatever. With a Bohemian accent, a hollow, monotonous voice, and defective German, this man ventured to preach the "divine folly of the gospel" to one of the most highly cultivated cities of Germany;" (von Polenz.) And yet the two-edged sword of the Spirit, managed by an apparently unskilled hand, entered with an almost irresistible power deep into the hearts of all his hearers, so that they either suffered their wounds to be bound up by him with the consolation of divine mercy, or, at least, for the most part, took home a sting of conscience.

To explain this we must look at the ecclesiastical situation of that time. In Dresden, as in Saxony generally, there was, to be sure, still an echo of the Wittenberg orthodoxy to be found, and therefore, externally, a more strict adherence to the Church-doctrine, than anywhere

else. We may recall here the names of such men as Reinhard and Tittmann, Rosenmüller in Leipsic, Schroeckh in Wittenberg, and others. Still, in general, the living breath of the Lord was missing, and rationalism ("*aufklärung*") was here also in fullest bloom. The preachers were, for the most part, only pulpit orators, and followed the great Reinhard more in logical form than in spirit. The simple, uncolored preaching of conversion by repentance and faith was rare.

If we now, in connection with these things, remember the powerful, exciting events of that time, the roar of cannon in and around Dresden; then the success of the Bohemian "preacher of repentance" (*Bussprediger*) will be more easily understood. Yet the powerful impression produced by his sermons, caused him soon to appear to many as a "dangerous man." For among the awakened ones, the inner fermentation manifested itself in different ways, sometimes in still seriousness and strict resignation of the world, sometimes in apparent melancholy, sometimes in a loud mania for converting others, sometimes even in a sort of insanity. Stephan's activity in Dresden, by his sermons and his zeal in "*cura animarum specialis and specialissima*," was at that time, until about 1825, undeniably blessed by the Lord in many respects! Also his dogmatical, imperious character did, at that time, not show itself so much, as afterwards, although in his small Bohemian congregation it became manifest from the beginning. In his personal intercourse he was extremely amiable, attractive and interesting, nay overpowering and winning the hearts "with magic force;" there was hardly a trace perceptible of any zealotical disposition; his nightly walks in the woods, of which he had always been very fond, and in which he generally indulged in company with a friend only, or with his Bohemian chorister, were still of an entirely harmless character.

The sensation produced by the fidelity of the strictly Lutheran preacher to his faith, and by the extraordinary success of his activity, increases the number of the curious, and gradually changed into hatred and contumely among the masses. Since gradually a German "congregation" had been formed in St. John's church, which gathered more and more closely around Stephan, and toward which he soon felt a greater attachment than towards his Bohemian congregations, so that in consequence

he neglected the latter more and more; since the Bohemian pastor contrary to his vocation and without any authority whatever administered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to his (German) followers, and besides usurped other "*actus ministeriales*" in this his so-called "congregation," the clergy of the church of the cross ("*Kreuz-Kirche*," the principal church of the old city Dresden) submitted to the church-superintendents on the 18th, of March 1820 a well supported complaint against him. But in spite of the admonition which he received from his superior, and in spite of his promises, everything remained as before, and his encroachments even increased.— But now soon the first public attack appeared on the part of an anonymous writer in the "correspondent from and for Germany" of the 25th of August 1821, in which Stephan was called a "misguided mind, lying preacher and fanatic, with a misleading doctrine, apt to undermine the state, who endeavored to found a sect; while his congregation was called a miserable band of weak-minded, short-sighted and crazed fanatics. These criminations of a "malignant slanderer" Stephan refuted by a "correction" in the "national Gazette of the Germans" No 47 (Nov. 21. 1821,) in which he said among other things: "I am neither a founder nor a leader of sects; I hate all sectarianism and fanaticism. I am an Evangelical Lutheran preacher;—my religion is neither *above* nor *below* the Bible, but written *in* the Bible and leads to Christ;—the recapitulations of my sermons I hold in my parsonage *with the doors open*;—in my congregation neither insanity nor murder has taken place, &c."

Since busy rumor now involved him more and more, by circulating scandalous reports and denouncing him with the police, he found himself compelled to submit to his superiors an "explicit well-founded declaration," which seems to have given complete satisfaction, (L. Fischer, page 19.) But to the inhabitants of Dresden he addressed in the month December 1823, a preface to two of his sermons "*Herzlicher Zuruf an alle evangelischen Christen*" published by C. Chr. Dürr, Dresden and Leipsic) in which he defend himself especially against the accusation of fanaticism and sectarianism, regarding which he expresses himself very plainly and correctly, bears witness to his adherence to the holy Scriptures and the symbols, and gives an explanation regarding his perfectly public "*hours of devotion*."

Still more important was in the year 1825, the publication of one year's sermons. Already the title of this work; "*The Christian faith, in one year's sermons*" &c., shows, that he intended to give here something complete, the Christian faith such as he was teaching it, his open confession. As he says there "he wished to preach the *pure apostolic evangelical doctrine*, such as is contained in the Old and New Testament, and thereby lead his hearers to a true belief in Jesus Christ, to an upright Christian life, to consolation in suffering and a happy death, without concerning himself in any way about some old or new human words, except when it was necessary to caution his hearers against errors." "With all diligence he had avoided all *pompous*, learned-sounding words. He had spoken more of *faith* than of *morals*, because the former is the source of all true sanctity, of all good works and all true comfort." "These sermons are not to be judged according to the now prevailing rationalism" &c., (compare the Preface.) They are indeed entirely biblical and worthy to be recommended to souls, desiring their salvation. The official opinion of the "Ephorus" Dr. *Heymann* (1838) says regarding them: Stephan's assurance "that he himself believes what he preaches" is not to be doubted; he preaches in strict accordance with the symbolical doctrine, in as simple words as possible; there are indeed truly edifying passages and instructive sermons to be found in the book. The popularity of the author however consist more in the use of common, but often not well comprehended words and phrases, than in a plain, well arranged and sufficiently precise expression of strictly logical propositions. The reader meets often (?) with false or only partially true assertions, incorrect explanations of biblical passages, and misses a more profound entering into the individual life of the hearers, to which the divine word might be specially applied. As regards the subject-matter, the doctrine of man's natural corruption and of the atonement by Christ are principally dwelt upon, in a manner which, with the exception of a few exaggerations caused by lack of precisison, does not essentially differ from the Church-doctrine. Pernicious, however, and not to be justified in this way, are the assertions of miracles which even now are taking place and to be expected (Part II. Page 331,) as also the assertions,

that those teachers of the Church who have denied "the existence and name" of the devil, and contended against his work only under the name of the evil spirit of the age and of vice, are "servants of the devil" (I p. 329), and that God in years of famine deprived the bread of its nourishing virtue (I. p. 322). Connected with such expressions is a very awkward quareling with those of different opinions [of this Stephan was especially fond in his hours of devotion, according to the testimony of all witnesses] and particularly very harsh criticisms of those teachers, whom Pastor Stephan considered as infidels. With such defects these sermons might easily foster fanatical belief in miracles [as it *actually was* to be found here and there among the Stephanites], superstitious ideas of God's judgments and intolerant tendencies. Adversaries among his hearers, though bearing witness to the purity of the Lutheran doctrine he preached, assured that *he accused as heretics all who were not his followers*, and invited them in the main to believe blindly. His own followers are all more or less distinguished by *a stubborn adherence to the letter of the Bible and of the symbols, which they are far from correctly understanding*, and by great zeal for the doctrine preached by Stephan, &c.

Thus reads in the main the corresponding passage in the report of the commissaries who since November 1839 had been charged with the examination of the complaints against Stephan. The publication of these sermons, we are told by one well informed ("The emigrants and the Lutheran church,") proved to be "a very decisive turning-point for Stephan." That time was "the period of his bloom, for he then enjoyed the undivided respect and love of more than one thousand persons among whom there were many families of rank; within the sphere of his activity there reigned an active Christian life; his position with regard to the outside world could hardly be called a hostile one; in spite of many calumnies and his preceding unpleasant experiences, the number of his friends had increased; in his heart there dwelt an apparent serenity on account of the many mercies which God had granted him in his calling" &c. But for the mass of his hearers his stock of sermons became now "as it were, a symbolical book." "Many who had listened for years to his lengthy sermons, which were rarely logically arranged, without being plainly conscious of his doc-

trine, became so by means of this book; those more accustomed to reading received in it a standard, by which to decide all dubious cases and religious disputes, so that Stephan now also not only on Sundays, but every day and at any time, became their spiritual adviser, teacher, and comforter. This book gave likewise a special impulse and aid to his later adherents, to secure authority to Stephan's name in the province. In general the absolute devotion of the "*Stephanites*" to Stephan's doctrine and person grew more and more; "it turned more and more into a carnal attachment to, and dependence from, the creature, without Stephan's trying to prevent it, as it would have been the duty of a minister and experienced Christian, and thus detracted from the Lord's glory" (Pastor Blucher.) It did good to his heart which was naturally inclined to pride, nay he fostered it at least indirectly, by often emphasizing the dignity of the ministry in a manner touching the priesthood of the Old Testament, as also by assuming the authority of God's interpreter, when asked for his advice in domestic affairs, and almost claiming infallibility.

Thus he became for his followers more and more an indispensable spiritual adviser who enslaved their consciences and influenced the manner of thinking and acting of his parishioners as any Catholic confessor." His declaration ended all hesitation, all disputes. *He gave divine oracles from the tripod, by identifying his word with the word of God.* This has been admitted by ministers of the strictest Lutheran faith, who in former times were well disposed towards him. And indeed he pronounced everything with such a wisdom and knowledge of human nature, and with such an assurance, that simple minds especially necessarily considered his sayings and his advice as equivalent to God's word. No doubt he has in this manner given good advice to many and prevented them from many follies; yet on the whole he very much hindered the souls in their Christian course by so doing, nay even often frustrated in them the beginning work of grace; for many thought it now sufficient for being good Christians, to strictly follow Pastor Stephan's advice and prescription, or even only to be in outward alliance with him and as it were to touch the hem of his garment. The former produced a legal (or judicial) manner of acting, the latter an external, secular (worldly) one, which now principally

led to the frequently mentioned and ill-reported *nightly* promenades and meetings, in and outside of the city.

Before discussing these more at length, we must, indeed, in justice to truth, call attention to the fact that there were very different degrees of Stephanites. Some only attended his sermons, perhaps, even the confessional, but kept aloof from the "hours" (of devotion) and from intercourse with him. The middle class attended the sermons and the "hours," honored in Stephan more the teacher than the minister proper, and thought to be permitted to listen also to other faithful preachers. "The Stephanites" proper, at last, not only *exclusively* attended Stephan's church and devotional exercises only, but owned him as their minister and spiritual father; many, in later years, as *him on whom alone the salvation of their little band and of the Lutheran Church depended*. These formed a circle close around the master; they principally attended the "conversational hours" (*Sprechstunden*), went everywhere in quest of him, accompanied him on extensive, mostly nocturnal, walks, and short excursions on foot, and celebrated the day as a holiday, when Stephan made them happy by a personal visit. Among these were also the most decided Christians, and men of the best civil respectability, yet also people of very unclean minds, uncharitableness and dubious reputation.

In order to meet the social wants of Christians of the lower classes (especially of artisans, for whom there were not then, as now, all kinds of "associations"), Stephan caused the formation of clubs (*"geschlossene Gesellschaften"*), which originally served in an entirely lawful manner only the purpose of recreation, not of edification, and were moving within the bounds of order and of decency. This club was invited by the pastor once a month, on some Sunday evening. On a joyful feast-day it was permitted to bring the wives and daughters. In consequence of his unfortunate habit of lucubrating, however, Stephan never made his appearance before ten P. M., "which therefore turned the perfectly innocent evening gathering into a lucubration, which was generally protracted until after one A. M., and gave so much the greater offence to the world, as Stephan's return home led him through one of the most suspicious streets of the city, and as several of his followers with their wives used to accompany him.

With these evening-parties, soon also summer-parties were connected, which, likewise, ended only late at night, often even on the next morning. Stephan was *completely deaf* to all friendly representations regarding the indecorum of these nightly meetings and regarding the offensive accusation which they made in the world; justifying himself on the ground of *his* dietetic welfare, and could not even then be dissuaded from them, when they involved him and his family in actual vexations, besides producing the saddest consequences in other families (disturbance of domestic peace, suits for divorce, &c.)

Thus far *von Polenz*, who is certainly acknowledged as competent, mild and just. How then judged those outside, the vulgar and exasperated adversaries?

In truth, *Stephan* has, *by acting thus, given great offence*, even if it were true, what Rev. Fischer, the author of the book, "the false martyrdom," &c., was told in the most solemn manner by some of his faithful followers, "that, according to their knowledge, not the least suspicious and indecent things had occurred at first." (page 49.) If any of his followers expressed their disapprobation, they made themselves liable to be excommunicated. The more considerate withdrew from all *personal* intercourse, but still continued to attend his sermons, according to Matt. 23 : 2 *sq.* : "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not." The excitement in the city against Stephan and the Stephanites continually increased; boundless opprobrium and bitter scorn were lavished upon them, the most romantic tales were circulated and found credence. But they became, more and more, insensible to the hatred of the world; they bore "the cross for Christ's sake," "the disgrace of Christ!" at last, the authorities were compelled to interfere, when, in 1835, the news of the Koenigsburg hypocrisy ("muckerei") and alleged (scandalous) "developments" (*Enthuellungen*) were circulated and produced the profoundest moral indignation. The police succeeded in ascertaining one of the secret meeting-places and surprised the pastor in the midst of his flock, yet the suspicion of "Muckerei" found no sufficient support. But to obviate any further offence, Pastor Stephan was, in the same year, (1835) prohibited by the authorities from holding any nocturnal meetings *i. e.*, such as were protracted until ten P.

M. Stephan promised to abide by this decision, and actually conducted himself for a while more cautiously; yet soon he resumed his nocturnal doings more boldly and in a worse manner still. No doubt he had already then plans of emigration in his mind, or rather had revived them and cherished them more decisively than before. Other events also contributed to this.

The year 1830, with its political movements, had deprived the Bohemian pastor of the direct protection of his powerful patron, the privy-minister Count Einsiedel (1861); also other influential men of high rank, who were well disposed toward him (Minister von Geobig, President of the Consistory, von Forber and others) had died or resigned: "It certainly was a *more powerful arm* which then still protected Stephan, in order by another and deeper fall, to lead him to the knowledge of himself." (von Polenz).

To the most exasperated attacks, the most violent invectives and abuses, which filled the public prints now to excess, and often in the most unworthy manner, Stephan opposed complete silence in public. To again answer them, "the dear minister considered as beneath the dignity of his holy office." (Confession, page 6). But one of his most faithful disciples, candidate Poeschel, a perfectly pure and pious, humble soul, but entirely taken with Stephan's imposing mind (he died as pastor in Hoffnungsthal, near Odessa), who afterwards, in reward for his confident, unlimited devotion to pastor Stephan, was excommunicated by the latter, *on account of an alleged difference of doctrine*, published, in 1833, a *Confession (Glaubens Bekenntreiss)* of the St. John's congregation in Dresden (which, according to the ecclesiastical law, had no existence by the side of the Bohemian one,), at the same time, as a refutation of the criminations made by some public prints against it and its pastor," in which book we read, among other things (page 118 sq.): "We bear witness, with firmness and decision, before God and all the world, that we have (since 25 years) heard no other doctrine from him than that which is in conformity with the whole word of God, of the Old and New Testament. He preaches to us with clear and plain words, the whole plan of God for our salvation, the law and gospel, &c.; as a conscientious preacher, he adheres to his religious oath (upon the Symbolic Books); *Pastor Stephan is a conscientious, honest man,*

he is what he pretends to be, an old-Lutheran preacher." The inuendo against most of the preachers of city and country, is not to be mistaken, and it is to be regretted that Stephan and the Stephanites emphasized only too much and too one-sidedly the *old-Lutheran*, while entirely disregarding the Holy Spirit which always *continues to work*, and despising the whole work of the modern Church, which they, day after day, condemned as heretic *neology*.

With the Prussian Old-Lutherans Stephan stood always, until after 1830, in intimate communion; and some of their exiles, Dr. Scheibel, Wehrhan, Krause, Wermelskirch, found, in 1832, an asylum in Saxony; with the fanatic dissidents in Wurtemberg and Baden he remained closely connected, until the time of his emigration. But in Saxony, the number of his followers had (especially since 1827) greatly increased, particularly in the valley of the Mulde to the district of Altenburg, also in Leipsic and other places. Many of the "Lutheran" ministers who formerly were on friendly terms with him, he now denied, and defied calumnies and condemnations. He, no less than his people, assiduously speaks of heretics, blasphemers, despisers of the Bible, &c. *The young ministers, who were devoted to him with blind confidence, and who formerly, as candidates, had been under his spiritual care, worked entirely in his severe, and with his zealous, hierarchical, manner, especially pastor Keil, in Wiederfrahme and the brothers Walther* (both the pastor and substitute); *only they lacked his prudence.* Stephan visited them every year and preached to an immense concourse of people in their churches. He had, as it were, his "stations" throughout the land, which were waiting for his wink.

Discord, severe differences, the most bitter enmities, broke out, in numerous congregations, among the parishoners, between the pastor and his flock, as also with the neighbors, in consequence of the *usurping, zealous and condemnatory conduct of the only orthodox "ecclesiola."* At the same time the Stephanites and their head, nevertheless, *complained of persecutions and oppressions, saying that God's word was bound, and the Lutheran Church in danger.* (For a time, since 1832, the introduction of a "union," as in Prussia, had been dreaded.) And yet both secular and ecclesiastical authorities practiced the greatest possible and wise clemency and forbearance; whilst *they were bent upon martyrdom!*

The doings of the Bohemian pastor, on the one hand, which became more and more bold and provoking, and, on the other hand, the power of excited public opinion, which became still more excited by the zealous conduct of Baron Uckermaner, a Stephanite, with his fulminating invectives against all neologists, heretics, infidels, demagogues, servile persons, &c., in his *Epistles to Prof. Krug*, (Sondershausen, 1837) compelled the authorities to interfere. Even the Diet ("*Landtag*") of 1837 took the affairs of the Stephanites into consideration, treated them very thoroughly, and the sharpest speeches were heard regarding them; yet they also found warm champions. The minister of religious matters ("*cultus minister*") von Carlonitz, made the following declaration in the Chamber: "This subject, of which I had heard already several years ago, was too important as not to impose it as a matter of conscience upon me in my present position, to investigate it as accurately as possible. To this end I have perused all the documents in possession of the ministry relating to it. From these I have learned that such a suspicion has already, for a number of years, been the object of public attention, and of police investigations, and that a great number of specified cases, by inquiries made elsewhere, and by hearing many persons, has been thoroughly discussed; but I have not discovered one case, by which that reproach (of an injurious influence, leading even to the insanity of some individuals; perhaps also the reproach regarding the secret, scandalous proceedings) could have been in the least sustained." (Compare communications regarding the proceedings of the second constitutional Diet of Saxony, No. 298, also No. 204, Second Chamber; No. 272 First Chamber.)

On the 8th of November, 1837, the police, charged with the strictest vigilance in their investigation, succeeded, at last, to discover a number of Stephan's friends in the vineyard-house at Hoflösswitz, which had often been frequented by them, in the dead of night, and, early on the morning following, the pastor, who had followed them with his usual suspicious female companion, and concealed himself in the vineyard, and to arrest them. The question, whether religious *conventicles* were being held here, was most decidedly answered in the negative by both Stephan and his friends. The pastor was summoned to make his appearance in Dresden early on the next day (November

9th), against which he protested most solemnly. Immediately afterwards he was *suspended*, and so remained until the time of his departure. On the next Sunday (the 25th after Trinity-Sunday), one of his candidates preached on Matt. 24 ; 15 *sq.*, "of the abomination of desolation," and gave vent to the bitterest complaints regarding the persecutions of the just. Now the preacher at the orphan-house (afterwards superintendent) Steineck was appointed vicar with the Bohemian congregation, and *judicial proceedings* against Stephan instituted at the Royal Court of Justice, during which he did not recede from his *obstinate and stubborn* manner, and, which is much to be regretted, *took recourse even to falsehood and denial of facts*; for the cunning man knew how to extricate himself from every crimination, however well-founded, whether it referred to his suspicious conduct, or to his neglect of official duties, or to the peculation of charity-money, &c., with the Bohemian congregation.

The forementioned *Bohemian congregation*, it may be known, had already, at an early period, neglected pastor Stephan, and the more his German followers increased in numbers, did so more and more, and in the most unjustifiable manner, although he was really only their own right-chosen minister (*parochus rite vocatus*). Still consisting of about forty or fifty families of exiles, they were, at the time when Stephan took charge of the ministry, according to his own official statement, in a well-regulated, peaceful condition. During the proceedings instituted against him, he stated, that the discussion between him and his Bohemian congregation, had, in the first place, been brought about by the teachers of the congregation and their rationalistic tendencies. Especially the worthy chorister, Janeck, had been stigmatized by Stephan as a "heretic," which induced his son, already in 1814, to complain to the supreme consistorial court (high-consistory). About the same time, sixteen members of the Bohemian congregation had submitted to the Ephorus a written complaint, on account of neglect of the Bohemian service, of the sick and poor, and on account of many arbitrary acts on the part of the pastor, nay even applied for his deposition, on account of previous illicit intercourse with his Bohemian maid-servant. But another part of the congregation had handed in a written defence of Stephan, who had defended himself before Superintendent Dr. Tittmann,

and called the last-mentioned charge "a tissue of falsehood and malice," and thus the matter ended. Henceforth the Bohemian congregation had patiently acquiesced, and, after several complaints, without any result, finally remained silent. As to the officers of the congregation, Stephan knew how to *intimidate them by his imperious manner and "by violent measures."* As the first officer and treasurer of the congregation, he appointed a man who neither knew how to write nor to read. But, as by the offence which Stephan had given the Bohemian congregation likewise, without any fault of their own, appeared in a suspicious light before the public, they now handed in (April 17th 1838) a written complaint against their pastor, which they still further sustained, by an addition, under date of July 5th, of the same year. In the former, Stephan is charged with the following facts: 1. Carnal and unchaste conduct (an accusation founded upon statements which most grievously shock every better sentiment); 2. The dishonest management of the pecuniary interests of the congregation, and 3. Manifold neglect of his official duties, especially with regard to church, school, the sick and dying. (Among other things, they complained of his lying in bed until towards noon, in consequence of his lewdness, of his commencing the Bohemian service, out of laziness, one or two hours after the appropriate time, &c.) In conclusion they apply for his final suspension from office and the appointment of another pastor. In the second complaint the second point is more accurately specified, the irregularities, charged to him, are proved with regard to three funds (the poor-fund, the children's charity-fund, and the burial-fund) and, by means of ecclesiastical evidence, pastor Stephan is *convicted of having embezzled at least one hundred and thirty-four thalers*, which he appropriated in the name of recipients of alms which were already dead. They pray, first, for the institution of proceedings against pastors, on account of unfaithful administration of funds, speculation and fraud; second, they protest against granting him a pass for emigrating to America, as long as he shall not have settled his accounts, delivered the correct balances of the funds and inventory, and refunded the embezzled and speculated amounts of money, as also the amount of one hundred thalers, borrowed from the property of the congregation against his note of hand, but *for which he had, during a period of twenty-eight years, not*

paid any interest, including interest and cost; finally, they ask for the confiscation of valuable vessels, documents and other parts of the inventory, still withheld by him.

These complaints rendered the course of the proceedings against him more serious and dubious, after the latter had seemed already to take a more favorable turn. In the meantime since Stephan's suspension, the question of emigration had been seriously discussed by the Stephanites. He himself asserted, that he entertained this idea already since 1811. But now he pretended for a long time to be irresolute, in order to appear entirely resigned to God's will; only in the spring of 1838 he definitely declared *it to be his will that they should start*: and then a deliberation committee was appointed, and installments were paid in to the "credit-fund."

In the summer of 1838 Stephan had again taken up his residence in the bath of Radeberg; the nightly scenes in wood and meadow were repeated, and consequently also the measures of the police to suppress them, and since his secret escape, even without a pass, was feared, a judicial expedition was sent after him: but early in the morning only two girls, asleep, were found in his residence, while he himself had departed during the night to Dresden with two other girls (according to documentary evidence). Here now he was kept a prisoner in his own house from Oct. 15—24; yet he knew cunningly how to evade the practical efforts of this measure.

Every one awaited the issue with the greatest suspense; the Stephanites, who, ready for emigration, had partly started already, the remainder waited anxiously for their leader and shepherd, in compliance with a most humble direct supplication of Stephan to his majesty the King, (dated Oct. 20) the two pending judicial proceedings against him were *quashed* under date of Oct. 23, 1839—provided that Stephan would give bail to the amount of five hundred thalers for the security of the Bohemian congregation. His private imprisonment was immediately relaxed. In the hour of midnight between Oct. 27 and 28, Stephan clandestinely, and without taking leave of his family, left the city with post-horses, in order to join the emigrants in Bremen. There the "ecclesia pressa" ("six clergymen with about seven hundred souls, among whom there were ten candidates and four teachers")

had gathered; there (five) *songs of the exiles* ("exulantenlieder") were published: "to such an extent as here the disgraceful worship of men's persons had never yet been carried, and the actual idolatry of Stephan was rapidly developed upon the sea, toward its worst disgraceful completion in St. Louis." (Dr. Vehse.)

Stephan followed the ships which had preceded him (there were five in all, of which the "Amalia" was lost) with his "staff," on the 18 of Nov., continued his lewd debauchery after having passed through sea-sickness, showing himself cowardly and timid during the dangers of a storm, preached very seldom during the voyage which lasted sixty-four days "partly from laziness, partly to make himself rare," but becoming strikingly more and more dry and weak, caused in lieu his vicar to preach a series of sermons, (in which he told them, that they did not deserve "such a faithful servant of God.") Knowing how to silence his legal counsel and fearing a separation of the secular and spiritual power, he caused the office of a bishop to be offered to himself five days before their arrival in New Orleans. Shortly before their arrival in St. Louis, Stephan had the ill-reputed *declaration of submission* (*Unterwerfungserklärung*) drawn up upon the steamer "Selma," and had it signed, *by way of an oath, by all the men and women of the company*. In St. Louis itself where Stephan to the great injury of the emigrants permitted more than two months to pass unimproved, the bishop had his own way without any interference whatever; the vestments of the bishop, consisting of an extremely heavy golden chain, crook and mitre, are made; a real "rioting" is carried on in the "house" of the bishop, into which, to the general scandal, more and more young women are introduced.

At last, 1839 April 26, the bishop departs with a part of his company to the colony "Wittenberg" Perry county on the Mississippi, which in the meantime has been purchased; there, on rogation-day (May 5) several girls made the first disclosures, in the first place to Pastor Löber, of indecent intimations which "the grey-haired sensualist with a wicked abuse of God's holy name and word had made to them already during the sea-voyage," and afterwards confirmed them by oath.

On May 30, the *deposition and excommunication* was

pronounced upon one who had deceived at first himself and then, for so long and disgracefully, hundreds of our co-religionists. This was done on account of his sins against the Church, seventh commandment, extravagant embezzlement of the property of others, and false doctrine (Dr. Vehse Page 166.) Stephan, at first insolent, then to be sure very much humbled, was, on the next day with a compensation of one hundred piasters and the necessary equipment, exported to the opposite state of Illinois, whither afterwards his concubine Gertrude, who remained faithful to him unto death, followed him. There he died according to the official certificate "on the last day, or during the last days, of February 1846 in Randolph county," nearly seventy-two years old. The rumors of his return to Europe are without foundation. Another rumor says that he has again returned to the bosom of the Catholic church. [Kurtz, in his Church History so affirms.]

Now the emigrants had for some time to pass through hard struggles of physical want and inner dissensions. The clergymen would not very soon divest themselves of the hierarchical principles which Stephan had imparted to them. At last, 1840 Nov. 22, the congregation at St. Louis held an extraordinary fast-day, when their richly endowed Pastor O. Herm. Walther made a sincere, profound confession of repentance. Gradually also the external condition of the newly founded, now well regulated, congregations is said to be much improved.

Martin Stephan was an extraordinary man, an instrument of God, possessed of great gifts which he has used to bless, and abused to give offence, an irresistibly imposing form, a hero of one-sided intellectual culture, and rare, unbending power of will, who possessed the *knowledge* of (the old-Lutheran, especially the justifying) faith in an uncommon measure, but who (by his carnal lusts, *his unevangelical judicial character, and his unbounded vanity and tyranny*) did not experience the full life and vigor of faith in growing *santification*, and consequently also manifested the power of merciful *love* in an entirely one-sided manner, until at last, lost in mean selfishness, he seemed to have entirely lost it.

In order correctly and justly to judge this man, it is necessary above all to recall *his time* and the condition of the church at that time. Stephan too was a child of his

time. His and his followers' decided Lutheranism, formed a natural, for the history of salvation, *necessary* contrast to the infidelity and indifferentism of very many of his contemporaries. His transgressions, founded already in his powerful nature and the one-sided education of his youth, are to a great extent also to be charged to the *rationalistic* and hollow Christianity of weak *faith* at the time of his appearance in public, while his later excesses (and no doubt also his moral fall) are owing to the *enthusiastic, excessive, gradually quite blinding adherence and man-worship* of his *absolutely devoted followers* of both sexes, and to the not less blind, often unjust, enmities of his adversaries, both of which gradually were intensified to fanatical rage and asperity. Christ was revealed in these days as the rock of salvation, and as the stumbling block set as an occasion to fall for many in Israel, in order that the thoughts of wrong hearts might become manifest. The wonderful ways of God in his profound mercy, his fierce anger, and his chastising justice, became plainly manifest, for the awakening and judgment of his people.

"Stephan is a highly important manifestation, but at the same time one which cannot be judged from the standpoint of German science. If the present generation calls him unqualifiedly a *hypocrite*, there is no doubt some ground for this in his after-life; nevertheless this way of disposing of him is a very cheap, shallow and insignificant one. By judging him thus, the present generation is guilty of misjudging the man in the earlier period of his life, and shows that *they do not have any idea* of what it meant in those times, to preach the "foolishness" of the gospel (1. Cor. 1 : 23) in *such a manner as he did it*. Thé recollection of the poor, deeply fallen man will be dear to me and to many of my race." Thus *von Polenz*, who knew him *very intimately*, writes to me *now*, more than twenty years after his death. And with these words I should like to close, if my purpose did not require a critique as impartial as possible; hence a few more of the most remarkable criticisms upon him are here yet to be submitted.

Dr. C. E. Vehse who, as is well known, was on most intimate terms with Stephan for a long time down to his fall, says among other things: "Stephan is a psychological enigma: as clever a man as he was wicked." "I must say even now (after having been so fearfully undeceived,)

that in my whole life I have never heard anything more magnificent than his addresses in the devotional exercises of Sunday afternoons." Very striking, says he, is the opinion of a friend, who says: "On the one hand this enlightenment, this correct appreciation of the time in which we live, this high wisdom, this magnificence of God's word and holy name in his sermons, this power to awaken, to comfort, to invite faith—and on the other hand I could not find God's image in himself." "Yes indeed" (adds Dr. Vehse,) "on the other hand, *after all nothing but a clerical impostor*. One cannot wonder enough at the cunning and astuteness, as well as at the marvelous good fortune, with which this man, for so long a series of years, was able to deceive the most intense attention of his friends and enemies, and to escape the most vigilant investigations of the authorities. The power of the Most High suddenly broke down the gray-haired sinner, just when he seemed to have reached the goal of his sinister desires. The net of seduction which he had cast over his congregation, was so fine and strong, and the helpmates of his rule so closely enticed and attached to him by the *hierarchical plans* he had laid open before them, that only the strong hand from above could break the *magic charm* in which all were held."

Pastor L. Fischer, in Leipzig, whose dogmatic standpoint made him a close and decided ally of Stephan, but who nevertheless does not spare him any more, and especially accuses him of "*flight from the cross*" (*Kreuzesflucht*), expresses the following appreciative opinion (in "*the False Martyrdom*" P. 54): "In Martin Stephan there lived a noble and powerful will, to further evangelical Christianity in every manner, but also a *persevering reluctance to come to an understanding and suitable agreement with science and the tendency of the times*. In free and bold speech he rose against the rolling current of infidelity and superstition (heresy,) and repelled it with vigor into its proper bounds; he did so in the rigid and inexorable forms of past centuries, and was of opinion, that the old, true evangelical life and substance could be saved in a new form for a new time. He has revealed a powerful strength amid lukewarm and weak surroundings, and has helped many an undecided and lost mind to a correct understanding of itself, and to a vivid, vigorous recognition of salvation. But with all his energy in thought and life he possessed too

little resignation, moderation and foresight. He has borne for long time much rash blame, a great deal of unjust opprobrium, much undeserved scorn, and even with Christian forbearance; but the self-reliance and the assurance with which he opposed all attacks, the sharp and cutting criticism regarding the much divided aspirations of the present generation, the *arbitrary steps*, at last, in which he continually indulged for his own person, *without caring for the offence he gave to the weak and unbelieving*, all this could very easily be interpreted as clerical pride, as a *bold undertaking and defiant arrogance* so that he also has been called a *priestly, unbending, Boeotian nature*. Regarding his doctrine, as no deviation from the Church-Creed has been proved against him. It may be, that he used occasionally his clerical authority for the purpose of undertaking arbitrary things, *bordering on tyranny* (nothing more): firmness of conviction, strength of character, an unbroken courage, an indestructible zeal, unconquerable perseverance, connected with energetic straight-forwardness and Lutheran sturdiness, cannot be denied to him. Although transient *fits of fanaticism and dangerous errors* may have occurred, his own mind is firm, quiet and clear, his judgment ever remained decided and free from inner contradictions, but not so his *conduct*. He with his people have proved a *salt* in our father-land." And, remarkably enough, in proof of Stephan's "charming" power of mind, even as late as 1838, here in Saxony a man such as the learned, pious *Franz Delitzsch* writes the following panegyric (in "science, art, Judaism" p. 2, after having in 1836 dedicated his first work: "Contributions to the history of Jewish poetry" &c., to Pastor Stephan as to his revered teacher and parental friend out of grateful love): "Martin Stephan is a man defamed and reviled by all the infidel and heterodox parties of our time, whose name is cursed only by the enemies, and blessed only by the friends of the Church—Martin Stephan is a beautiful, significant name; the spirit of Martin Luther, the first martyr's joyfulness of belief adorns him who bears it. Not a *new* doctrine is preached by Martin Stephan, my dear, much beloved teacher, as little as by Paul in Athens, or by Martin Luther, who decidedly repels the reproach of the newness of his doctrine,—nor an *antiquated* doctrine, as the men of progress and enlightenment say, who would like so much to destroy positive Christianity. It is the

ancient and still ever new prophetic word, powerful to destroy before God. * * This ever firm word of the living God, not the fashion-like changing philosophy or poetry of a misled reason or an unsettled heart, not a rationalistically developed or unevangelically indifferent Christianity, is preached by Martin Stephan. This word alone he preaches, pure, unadulterated and unvarnished, with arguments of the Spirit and with power, and this very word gives to the name of this man of God that profound significance, that sweet sound, whose echo will still resound in the future history of the Church. I joyfully seized at this man, not, as some may think, as at the shibboleth of a party, but as at a symbol of the old Lutheran Confession; I imprint his name upon my book as a golden frontis-piece, thus plainly symbolizing, in the very beginning, its tendency; it is to be written in accordance with God's word, in honor of the Church." With reference to this the forementioned L. Fischer now, however, rejoices (p. 14, "The False Martyrdom"): "*Stephan's spirit is, and remains, a sectarian and partisan spirit, who, during the latter part of his career among us had no longer any idea of (the martyr) Stephan's wisdom and joyfulness of faith, nor of Luther's simplicity, but who only in self-assumed clerical dignity went around to capture and enslave innocent souls; and, although branded by public opinion and diverted by the members of his own household, yet did not cease, in his unchristian heedlessness, to scorn Christian freedom and give room to the scoffer.*" (p. 52): "Not so much the *doctrine*, as the *conduct*, of Pastor Stephan, was it, that brought about his fall in Saxony." (p. 29): Stephan's last departure from his family (*in which he was a real tyrant*) is crushing, pitiless, accomplished with cold, rigid eyes, and a bold insolent face."

We conclude with the opinion of von Polenz ("Public Opinion," p. 17 sq.): "Stephan's faith, firm as a rock, in the Lord and his mercy, *was more objective, than a subjective, transforming one*; in his constant external struggles, he lost, more and more, that inwardness ("*Innerlichkeit*"), so necessary for the Christian, and became accustomed to the torch of the gospel more outwardly, than inwardly; he gradually lost all that he always, perhaps even shortly before his fall, had, in so rich a measure, given to others; and, in fine, he was more a *servant*, than a *child*, of God." (p. 77): "He presents, as it were, the type of *proud soli-*

business, of one-sided, rude separation; and accessible as he was only to his own people, who almost worshiped him as an idol, he would have had to be an angel, if the idea of his own infallibility had not taken root in him. THIS IDEA THEN NECESSARILY PASSED OVER INTO THE MINDS OF HIS FOLLOWERS TO SUCH AN EXTENT, THAT THEY BELIEVED, THEY EXCLUSIVELY REPRESENTED IN THEMSELVES, NOT ONLY THE LUTHERAN, BUT ALSO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, and ADMITTED OF NO SALVATION OUTSIDE OF THEIR CIRCLE." (p. 23): "In regard to ecclesiastical history, the reproach of a *"donatistic stamp,"* which, among others, is raised in the "declarations of some evangelical Lutheran clergymen," &c., is the one which has the most foundation.

ARTICLE XI.

THE MEEKNESS OF MOSES.

By REV. JACOB FRY, A. M., Reading, Pa.

"Who was the meekest Man?" "Moses."

This question, with its answer, has been familiar to many of our readers since they were Sunday School children. We propose in this paper to look at the title, or attribute, thus ascribed to Israel's great law-giver and leader, and see whether it is proper and warranted by the Scriptures, to apply this disposition, in so sweeping a manner, to him.

The only passage in which this "meekness" is affirmed of Moses, is Numb. 12 : 3 : "*Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.*" Frequent reference is made to his fidelity, courage, labors, wisdom, sufferings, etc., but this is the only passage, on which is based the expression that he was the meekest of the Old Testament saints. This one verse would be sufficient to establish his claim to this great virtue, if the translation was strictly correct, and justified by the context and the circumstances of the case. But all these are against it, as we purpose showing, and this fact leads us to inquire whether some other truth may not be

intended to be taught in this verse, which our translation has not apprehended

Our first objection is based on the translation. The word in the original, which is here rendered "meek," is ¹²⁷ which signifies, *oppressed, afflicted, tormented, etc.*, and is generally applied to those who suffer wrong, rather than do wrong, and sometimes, in the plural form, is used as a substantive to denote and describe this class of people. The case before us is the only one, where, in its normal adjective form, it is translated *meek*; on all other occasions it is rendered *afflicted, oppressed, etc.* There seems good reason for suspecting our translators consulted largely the Septuagint version in their work, and we are inclined to believe the Septuagint word *πραυς* suggested the English word *meek* to them. It is not the only instance in which the force and meaning of the original has been lost, and the sense of passages perverted by our translators following too closely the LXX.

Neither do we find the circumstances of the case, or the context of the passage justifying the idea of meekness in the instance before us. Not that we affirm an absence of meekness or humility in the character of Moses. His patience, under provocation, was very great. But we believe something else was intended to be taught, concerning him, in the expression before us. The passage occurs in the history of the desert wandering, on the occasion of the conspiracy, started by Miriam and supported by Aaron, against the exclusive authority of their brother Moses, in matters pertaining to the leadership and government of Israel. His marriage with Zipporah, who had rejoined him at Sinai, and was now traveling with the Hebrews to the promised land, was the ostensible pretext of this conspiracy or opposition. They wished to make it appear that the leadership of Israel belonged alike to each member of the family of Amram, and not to the youngest only. Then comes the assertion that Moses was very meek, above all men on the face of the earth. We confess to a dulness of comprehension why this declaration of his meekness should be made by Moses in this connection. The ordinary explanation that Moses' allusion to it here, was to show that he did nothing to resent the charge or to justify the authority he had assumed, is, at least, far-fetched. In after years, when a larger and more formidable conspiracy was started against him by Korah and his company, he certainly took immediate steps to assert and prove

his authority, although apparently aware of the fact that it would result in the awful overthrow which befell the conspirators. A score of passages occur in his life, where an assertion of his meekness would be far more in place and to the point, than here.

Furthermore, there are passages in Moses' life, which reveal a nature quick and impulsive, which cannot easily be reconciled with the statement that he was very meek, above all men on the face of the earth. We refer, for example, to his killing the Egyptian whom he spied, smiting a fellow-Hebrew, which occurred in the days of his ripe manhood, and to his hasty flight to the land of Midian, in consequence of it. Stephen says he was at this time "full forty years old." It can, therefore, hardly be attributed to youthful rashness, but it reveals the strong, earnest and daring spirit, which (rather than mere meekness) fitted him to be the heroic deliverer and courageous leader of his enslaved people.

In his descent from Sinai, when his eyes rested on the molten calf, and the idolatrous worship Israel was paying it, he certainly manifested a spirit of holy indignation, rather than of holy meekness. His record is: "Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hand, and brake them beneath the Mount." It may be that he brake these tables simply as a sign or testimony against the children of Israel, because they had broken the covenant in their idolatry; but we are inclined to the opinion that he brake them because his "anger waxed hot." In this conviction we are sustained by the fact that when the covenant was renewed, God commanded him to "hew two tables of stone like unto the first which thou breakest." In the first instance, God had furnished the two tables of stone as well as the commandments written upon them; now he commands Moses to furnish them, evidently by way of restitution for those which in anger he had demolished. His course, in this matter, and the way in which Jehovah refers to it, convinces us that, on this occasion, Moses was not the meekest man on the face of the earth.

Scarcely had Israel left Sinai, before the murmurings were heard again in the camp, (Num. xi.) and Moses, in a spirit rather of petulance than of meekness, finds fault

with God for the burden put upon him, and, not very meekly adds: "If thou deal thus with me, kill me I pray thee, out of thine hand."

At Meribah, Moses' meekness is no more apparent than at Sinai. Israel was murmuring with thirst, and God had commanded Moses to speak to the rock, and they would find relief. In place of obeying this simple direction, he turns to the congregation and says: "Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?" In place of speaking to it, as commanded, he (evidently in ill-temper,) smites the rock twice with his rod. This occurred many years after the record had been made that he "was very meek." And it was because he thus failed to sanctify God in the eyes of Israel; because "he spake unadvisedly with his lips," or, in other words, because he manifested not, at least on this occasion, the proper spirit of meekness, he was forbidden to lead Israel into the promised land, or to tread his foot upon its sacred soil.

But the strongest objection we have to this rendering of the passage above quoted, is, that it occurs in one of Moses' own books. It exposes him to the charge of egotism, that *he*, with his own hand, in this account of his life, makes the declaration that he "was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." Had Joshua, or Samuel, or any other prophet or scribe made the record, the difficulty would be obviated; but for Moses to say this of himself is so much out of place, and so contrary to the noble qualities which so eminently characterize the man, that we cannot believe this to be his meaning. The common explanation, that he was moved by inspiration to record this of himself, will scarcely stand, as the same inspiring Spirit moved Solomon to write: "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth." Moses never sings his own glory. He gives us a faithful record of his life, in which we can easily learn the greatness and goodness of the man, but he never says that he was either great or good. Therefore we do not believe he meant to say what our English Bible makes him say of himself in this passage, that he was meek above all men upon the face of the earth. If he was not the meekest man, the passage could not mean to say he was; and if he was the meekest man, *he* would not say so,—his very meekness would forbid it.

But what does the passage mean? We do not believe it to be an interpolation by a later hand; it is a part of Moses' own record. What, therefore, does he mean to say here of himself?

We have already alluded to the force and ordinary meaning of *וְיָצַח*, *afflicted, tormented, grieved*, and this primary meaning we believe Moses intended in this passage: "Now the man Moses was *greatly tormented*, above all men which were upon the face of the earth." In this interpretation we are sustained by the force and meaning of the original Hebrew term, by the subject-matter and context of the passage, and by the whole history of the man who records it of himself, and likewise find the passage thereby relieved of all the objections enumerated in the former part of this paper.

Let us look at the narrative again, in Num. 12, in which this record is made. In the family of Moses, two women were dwelling, to each of whom he was closely attached. One was his sister Miriam, who had watched over him on the banks of the Nile; the other was his wife, Zipporah, the Cushite woman, the daughter of the priest of Midian. These two women, each dear to Moses, do not seem to have been so dear to each other. Both occupied high positions, one as the sister, the other as the wife of the leader of Israel, and they soon became jealous of each other's influence. Miriam especially suspects Moses to be too much under the control of his wife, and her high-toned Hebrew spirit cannot endure the thought that a woman who was not an Hebrew but a Cushite, should have any say in matters pertaining to Israel. She soon wins over her brother Aaron, whose conduct at Sinai showed him to be a weak man, and together they plan a revolt against the authority of Moses. It was a family quarrel, rather than a general conspiracy against him. The bulk of the congregation of Israel may have known nothing of it, until Miriam, with her leprosy, was shut out of the camp. It was the open break of a quarrel, in the tent of Moses, between these two women of his household, which may have been brewing for some time. Moses' position, under these circumstances, was exceedingly trying. Not only was it very unpleasant to decide between a wife and a sister, but it was to be tormented by their ceaseless bickerings at just that place and time, where he wanted quietness and peace. In the chap-

ter preceding this, we have his complaint to God about his excessive and trying labors, as the leader of all that congregation of Israel, and says: "I am not able to bear all this people alone, because it is too heavy for me." The constant and unceasing labors, growing out of his position as their leader, provider, lawgiver and judge in all their strifes, must have been fearful. Wearied and jaded at the close of each day, he retraces his steps homeward, to seek in the precincts and shadow of his own tent that peace and quiet, which his worn body and mind demand. But alas! for Moses. No sooner is his return announced than Miriam meets him with insinuations against Zipporah, and, perhaps, when she is gone, Zipporah has her tale against Miriam, until his spirit no longer can bear his infirmities, and, rushing from their presence, he puts upon record: "Now the man Moses was the MOST TORMENTED man upon the face of the earth." This renders the passage perfectly plain, and (it must be admitted,) exceedingly natural.

In affirming this to be the meaning of Moses, we are sustained by high authority, no less than that of Luther himself, who renders the passage, in his German version, in precisely the same way. "*Aber Mose war ein sehr GEPLAGTER Mensch ueber alle Menschen auf Erden.*" *Geplagter*, i. e., *plagued, harassed, pestered, &c.*, is very expressive of Moses' meaning, and is exactly adapted to express that state of mind which would be produced by the condition of affairs so strongly hinted at in the first and second verses of this chapter. This is only one out of many instances, which show the fidelity of Luther's version to the original Scriptures. While our English translators have been content to find *meek* in the Septuagint *πραυς*, or probably in the Vulgate *mitissimus*, Luther has gone directly to Moses' own Hebrew, and finds in it his expressive *geplagter*, which presents an entirely different idea, and the one which is doubtless correct.

Viewed in this light, the passage is relieved of the difficulties which otherwise surround it. It accords entirely with the original, it follows most naturally the state of affairs described in the preceding verses of the chapter, it relieves Moses of any charge of egotistical boasting, and coincides entirely with the history of his whole life. There may have been other men on the face of the earth more "*meek*" than Moses, but were there any who were more

tried and "tormented?" From the day his mother launched him on the waters of the Nile, yea from the day he drew his first breath and she "hid him three months," until God "buried him in that valley in the land of Moab where no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day," his life was a series of constant conflicts, perplexities and cares. In the land of Egypt, in the land of Midian, and in that desert pathway to Canaan, in every change in his wonderful career, he found but little of rest and peace. Well may he say, in the Psalm generally attributed to him: "All our days are passed away in thy wrath; we spend our years as a tale that is told." In his early years he was tormented by the sword that hung over him by Pharaoh's edict, and the suffering condition of his people; in the land of Midian, by banishment and separation from his brethren whom he dare not rejoin without peril to his life; and when sent back by the word of the Almighty, it is to withstand Pharaoh and his princes, and wring from them an unwilling permission to lead the Hebrews out of their captivity. Yet only then did his perplexed and trying condition really begin. The taunts and threatenings of the Egyptians his spirit might bear, but how, when murmurings and seditions, by the very people whom he had delivered and befriended, began to rise against him! Now for want of water, then for want of flesh, then because of the roughness and length of the way, until every conceivable difficulty was made the pretext of new complaints against him. Surely he was tried and harassed beyond measure, until human nature could endure in silence no more.

Yet it was not the oppression of Pharaoh, nor the banishment and solitude of Midian, nor the murmurings and rebellion of his people that wrung from Moses the declaration before us. It may provoke a smile, but it is nevertheless a suggestive fact that it was the perpetual jealousy, disagreement and bickering between two women in his tent, which furnished the occasion for Moses to declare he was "greatly tormented, above all men which were upon the face of the earth." It suggests that a man's greatest trials may be domestic, and his worst foes they which are of his own household. In the world we must have tribulation. Every true man expects it, and prepares for it. But every man wants his fire-side, or the

door of his tent, to be the place where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest. And that which tries his courage and spirit most, is the discovery that peace is not there. This is what crushed Moses, and extorted this statement from his pen. If it be thought too small a matter for him thus to notice, we need but remind the reader that not only Moses, but God took notice of it. When Miriam's fault-finding with Zipporah had no effect on Moses, she turned on Moses himself, and "spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian (*Marg.* Cushite,) woman whom he had married." She first tattled to Moses and then tattled against him; and this tattling "God heard." Summoned before the tabernacle, she was reproved by Him out of the cloudy pillar, and when that pillar arose, she stood "leprous, as white as snow." He who avenged His servant in the chastisements of Israel for their murmurings and rebellions against him in the camp, avenged him also, in the fearful leprosy of Miriam, for being tormented in the repose of his tent. They who disturb the peace of a family may be as guilty and criminal in His sight, as they who divide nations and communities into factions and cliques. Indeed, could we understand the secret and hidden springs, whence started the great schisms and strifes of mankind, we might find them in just some such scene as this, where two women, (or persons of either sex,) moved by envy, begin to speak against each other. And if we could ask the mighty ones of earth, who have endured its conflicts and shaped its destinies, on what field they found their greatest trials and heaviest burdens, many would stand beside Moses and point to the doors of their tents as the scenes, where they were "tormented above all men who were upon the face of the earth."

ARTICLE XII.

THE NEW-LANDERS AND GERMAN REDEMPTIONERS.

By Rev. R. WEISER, Mahanoy, Pa.

Our German Forefathers experienced many trials and hardships when they first came to this Western World.

The ancient Romans loved to read the account of their ancestors' first coming to the shores of Lavinia, driven by the fury of the fates and the ire of the gods, and their poets embellished their works with the difficulties and conflicts, through which they passed. The descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers in this country also love to dwell upon the toils and obstacles, which their noble sires encountered. So also the Israelites, after they had gone through the wilderness, when they had passed over the Jordan, and were quietly located amid the vine-clad hills of Palestine, often doubtless thought and spoke of the hardships of their fathers in the wilderness. Joshua, Samuel and David often reminded the Israelites of the severe trials of their Fathers, and how God conducted them through the Red Sea and through the wilderness, and brought them to a land of plenty, a land flowing with milk and honey. The Jews were reminded of these things, in order to awaken their gratitude and piety. So we, the descendants of Germans, may also call to remembrance the trials, the poverty and the hardships of our Forefathers. The Germans commenced their immigrations to this country in the earlier part of the eighteenth century. They at first came in small parties; towards the middle of the eighteenth century, there were large numbers in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia. "A few Germans came to this country" says Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg, "in the latter part of the seventeenth century. But they did not come in any very great numbers, until 1709-20. During this period large immigrations took place from Hesse-Darmstadt, Wittenberg, the Palatinate and other parts of Germany."* Dr. Muhlenberg had a member in his church in Philadelphia, who came to America in 1680. We have no means of reaching even the proximate number of Germans who were here before the end of the seventeenth century, but there must have been very many, as we know there was a German and Dutch Lutheran church, erected in New York in 1671. When Dr. Muhlenberg arrived in 1742, they were already numerous. About 1720, immigration was great. They were mostly the poorer classes, and having experienced difficulties at home and receiving letters from their friends who had already

*Hallische Nachrichten, vol. 1, page 665.

reached this country, thousands were anxious to join them. But they had not the means. Ship-owners in London and Hamburg, in Rotterdam, Amsterdam and Bremen knowing, how desirous the poor Germans were to come to America—and aware too that labor was in great demand in the New World, hit upon a plan, by which the Germans could be brought to this country without pecuniary resources, and yet they, the ship-owners and sea-captains, could make money. The plan was this; the ship would go to a German port, Hamburg, or Bremen, and send agents into the crowded districts of Germany, and they, by word of mouth, placards, or pamphlets, would give a glowing description of the New World, and hold out the strongest inducements to the Germans to emigrate. When the poor Germans would tell them, that they had not the means to pay their passage across the ocean, they would reply: "You can soon earn enough in America." They, of course, did not tell them anything of the *white slavery*, into which they would be sold. These wicked and unprincipled men were then called "*New-Landers*;" they are now called "*Runners*." Dr. Muhlenberg saw through their villainies, and gives an excellent description of them in the *Halle Annals*. He says: * "I cannot omit here to make some remarks concerning a class of men called *New-Landers*, and to warn my German countrymen against them. I do not now speak of those Germans who visit Germany on their own legitimate business, or that of others. But I speak of those who make it a business to go to Germany on pretence of collecting legacies for themselves or others, but in reality to induce, by fraud and deception, the poor Germans to leave their country and come to this new world. These men go to the rich merchants in the Netherlands, and make contracts with them for so much a family or if single persons, so much a head, for all they can bring to the port. These men, in order to induce as many as possible to accompany them, resort to all kinds of deception and fraud. They dress in the grandest manner, carry fine gold watches and chains, and often draw out their handsome gold watches, in order to impress the poor ignorant people with the wealth of the New World, and to increase their desire to settle in so rich a country. They give such representations of America, that one is almost ready to believe

*Vol. II. p. 997.

that the whole land consists of Elysian fields, that sow themselves without toil or labor; that the mountains are full of gold and silver, and that the springs all flow with milk and honey. These men tell them, that he who goes to the New World, as a man-servant will become a gentleman, the farmer will become a nobleman, the mechanic, a Baron; that in America the government is made by the people, and if the government does not suit them they can abolish it. The family is broken up, the little household furniture is turned into money, the debts are paid, and if there is any money left, it is given into the hands of the *New-Lander* for safe keeping. The journey is commenced down the Rhine, and with this journey the expenses of the emigrant already begin. When they reach Holland, as they cannot always immediately leave, the merchants advance them money freely. Then come the head tax, and the fare to America. Before they leave Holland, they are compelled to sign a deed, or indenture, and as this instrument of writing is in English, the poor immigrant does not know what it is, but the *New-Lander* tells him to sign it, that he will see justice done to his countrymen. The more passengers the better, the more money is made, provided the passengers do not die on the way. Therefore the ships are kept clean and pure, and all proper means are used to keep the goods in a marketable condition. Some times, in former years, they were not so careful, and many died during the passage. When the parents die, the captain and *New-Lander* constitute themselves the guardians, break open the chests, take possession of the property, and, when they reach America, sell the children to pay the passage of their dead parents. And all that was left by the parents is claimed by these wicked men as a compensation for their guardianship. These heaven-crying enormities stirred up the better sort of Germans in Pennsylvania, and especially in Philadelphia, to organize a society, whose object was, to see that justice was done these unfortunate German immigrants. As soon as the ships are loaded with their human freight in Holland, the hard and dangerous voyage begins. The sweet hope of soon reaching the New World, and enjoying the earthly paradise there to be found, bears up the

*Baron Steuben was a member of this Society.

poor deluded immigrant, amid the inconveniences and hardships of the voyage.

After a long and tedious voyage, (sometimes three and even four months) the ship arrives at the Port of Philadelphia, when perhaps rough winter is at the door. As soon as the ship arrives, the ship merchant receives a list of the immigrants with the indebtedness of each for the passage across the ocean, and the journey down the Rhine, and the amount that had been advanced by the *New Land-der* together with the bill for provisions during the voyage. The fare of a single passenger formerly was from forty to fifty dollars, but now it is from sixty to seventy-five. Before the ship is permitted to cast her anchor, she must be visited by the Port Physician, to see whether she is free from infectious diseases. Next the immigrants are all marched to the Court-house, where they are required to swear allegiance to the king of Great Britain; they are then marched back to the ship. It is next announced in the public papers, that there are so many German immigrants to be sold, to pay their passage across the sea. Those who have the means to pay their own fare can do so. Those who have friends in this country, able and willing to advance the funds needed, can also pay their fare. The ship is the market house. Those who wish to purchase servants go among the immigrants and select such as they want; they then agree as to the time they are to serve, and the price of their labor. They afterward take them to the merchants, pay the amount demanded, appear before a Justice of the Peace, and an instrument of writing is drawn up and signed, in which the immigrant becomes, for the time, the property of the purchaser specified in the deed. The young unmarried men and women are generally the first that are selected. It has often been observed that those young people who were disobedient to their parents, or who had left home contrary to the wishes of their friends, often fall into the hands of those who pay them for their wickedness. The old and feeble no one wants; there are already too many of that class in this country. But if those who are sickly and feeble have healthy children, the amount of their fare is added to that of their children, and the children are then to serve so much longer. These children are separated from their parents and from each other, and scattered all over the land, among all nationalities, so that

they never see their parents any more, and often forget their native language. The poor old people whom no one will buy, are sent on shore to shift for themselves. They look like ghosts who have risen from the grave, and having no resources, and not being able to work, they go through the city among the Germans and beg. It is enough to make one's heart bleed to see and hear these poor creatures, deplore and lament their hard lot. In the bitterness and anguish of their souls, they call down the vengeance of heaven upon the heads of the *New-Landers*, and the ship merchants for having allured them from their homes, and thus cruelly deceived them. But the *New-Landers*, like the ancient Pharisees, only laugh at them and say: 'What is that to us, See thou to it.' The children too, when they see that they are to serve so much longer on account of their parents, are filled with hatred towards the *New-Landers*."

This graphic account may serve to give us some idea of the hardships, through which many of our German forefathers had to pass, on their first arrival in this new country. This nefarious system of fraud and deception continued for nearly one hundred years, from 1720 to 1819. Thousands and tens of thousands were annually sold into slavery. These unfortunate Redemptioners were as completely in the power of their masters, as the negro-slaves in the South. When they fell into the hands of brutal masters, they were treated with great inhumanity and cruelty. If anything were wanting to show to the world the elasticity, and indomitable energy of the Teutonic race, this system of tyranny and wrong would be sufficient. What has not this race wrought in one hundred and fifty years in America? This is the same race of hardy Germans who under their brave leader Ariovistus gave Julius Cæsar more trouble than all other nations. The origin of their name is this. They called themselves, Wer man, *i. e.* Warmen. In Latin there is no *w*, the Romans substitute the soft *g*—for the *w*, and that gives us Germans—Warmens. They were the ancient Cimbri, of whom Tacitus says; "They were defeated, but never conquered." The Saxones were a tribe of Germans, perhaps the most Northern, having had their location in the Chersonesus Cimbrica, corresponding with Denmark. The Angli resided just south of the Saxons, in the modern Holstein-Schleswick; sometimes they were called Sabalin.

gii. The Saxons first invaded England, afterwards the Angli, and these two hardy German races amalgamated with the ancient Atrebates, Regni, Iceni, Cornavii, Catieuchlani, and other tribes of Britains' and thus formed the greatest nation the world had ever seen. There was another tribe of Saxony, anciently called the Gambrivii, or Saxones Longobardi, but it was the Cimbrian Saxons who overran England. The Alemani literally, the *All-men*, is a term, which the Germans assumed after the defeat they encountered at the hands of Marius, they then formed an alliance consisting of many tribes and went by the name Alemani or "*All men*." The French still persist in calling all Germans, *Aleman*i.

In the days of Julius Cæsar these Germans were rude untutored Pagans, but they had muscle, nerve and brain. Our forefathers are the descendants of these stalwart Germans. They came to this country under the most untoward circumstances. Ground down in Europe under the iron heel of a cruel despotism, many of them were carried out of their native land by deception, defrauded of all they had, sold into bondage, and trodden under foot. They came into a strange land, and among a people of a strange tongue; scattered abroad over some six or seven States, they were everywhere regarded by the inhabitants of the country as an inferior race, as awkward, rude and uncivilized. But these Redemptioners were true to their obligations, although these obligations had been fraudulently imposed upon them. They served out their time with fidelity. No people in the world are more strict in observing an oath than the Germans; none more true to their engagements. How unfavorable the prospect, that a race of men, thus introduced into a new country, with everything adverse to them, groaning under a weight of prejudice, would ever be able to rise! And yet these Germans did rise; they surmounted all obstacles, and overcame all prejudices. Their industry, frugality and indomitable perseverance, triumphed over all things. They rose slowly, but surely. They went into the wilderness, and the axe swung by their brawny arms prostrated the mighty forests, and turned the haunts of wild beasts into smiling fields. There are now five millions of the descendants of the Germans in the United States, and although many of them have deteriorated, yet much of the spirit of the old Teutons still remains.

By this time their blood has freely intermingled with that of other nations. If the Germans have not actually founded a new empire, they have assisted in building up one, and they have contributed the broad chest, the strong arm, and a good part of the brains. A physiologist has recently said, that unless Scotland is saved by the admixture of Teutonic blood, consumption will put the whole nation under the ground in less than two centuries. We know, that it arrested England on its way to ruin. It is true the Germans that came to this country, even at an early day, were not all Redemptioners. We had a Baron Steuben, a De Kalb, a Muhlenberg, a Kunze, a Schmidt, a Helmuth, and many other honorable names, but in this free land, all states and conditions are on a level; the descendants of the nobleman and of the German Redemptioner stand on the same footing. The Germans have been a blessing to all lands, where they have settled. The great majority of them have been agriculturists, and whithersoever they have gone, the productiveness of the earth has been increased. The State of Pennsylvania has been brought into its high condition of cultivation by the Germans. We have often thought of the appropriateness of a Prayer, found in the old German Lutheran Liturgy of 1786, drawn up by Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg himself, after having been a resident of this country for nearly half a century, and having visited every settlement in the State, and seen the effects of German thrift and toil. He introduces this clause in a general prayer, to be used by the congregation: "And as it has pleased Thee, Oh compassionate Father! mainly through the Germans, to convert this wilderness into a delightful field, and to change this State into a flourishing garden, so do thou help us, that we do not deny our nation (*unsere nation nicht verbrennen*), but rather that we may labor in such a manner, that our dear children may be so trained, that German churches and schools may not only be preserved among us, but that they may, from time to time, become more and more prosperous." This prayer shows us how much stress the patriarch Muhlenberg laid upon the energy and industry of the Germans. Even during the Revolution, General Washington said: "We must look to the Germans of Pennsylvania for our bread." It is well known that New York and New England could not raise bread enough for

their inhabitants. Thomas Jefferson placed the highest value on the industry and perseverance of the Germans.

In 1780, the Lutheran Church was the largest in Philadelphia, and in Pennsylvania. In the rural districts she has maintained her position very well, and is, perhaps, in point of numbers and wealth, second to no other Church. But in the cities of New York and Philadelphia, she has been less successful. Nearly all the different denominations in these cities are far in advance of the Lutheran. The Lutheran Church was founded in New York city as early as 1670, just two hundred years ago, and now we have only two English Lutheran churches in that immense city. The German churches in New York, are more numerous, and are increasing. In Philadelphia the Church list stands very nearly as follows, viz.: The Presbyterian Church, including the Reformed Presbyterian, eighty-four; the Episcopal Methodist, seventy-two; the Episcopalian, seventy; the Baptist forty-two; the Roman Catholic, thirty-eight; the Lutheran, twenty. This is a sad record for our Church, the first founded in Philadelphia. The Swedish Lutherans erected their first house of worship in Philadelphia in 1646, two hundred and twenty-four years ago. Even the Quakers did not build their first meeting house until half a century afterward. The first Presbyterian church was built in 1704, and the first Episcopal church, in 1710. St. Michael's German Lutheran church was erected in 1743. There must have been something wrong in the polity of the Lutheran Church. There is certainly nothing wrong in her doctrines; her Confession is all right. What then has retarded her progress, whilst other Churches have far outnumbered her even on her own territory. Take the Methodist Church, which started in England among the poorer classes, and in this country commenced its glorious career in a sail-loft in New York, in 1766; the poor were its first converts, and yet that Church is far in advance of us. Now, it cannot be owing to the fact, that many of our forefathers were poor Redemptioners, that our progress has been so slow, because that evil (if it is one,) has long since been repaired by the thrift and perseverance of the Germans. For though our forefathers were, generally, poor in the beginning, their successors have become rich. There is an old German proverb: "No matter where the German goes, God will bless and prosper him." The soul of the pious

German Redemptioner was as dear to God, even in his bondage, as the soul of the most highly favored among the children of men. It is wonderful to think of the leadings of God's Providence. Many of these poor Redemptioners, who had to serve for four, five and seven years, and, after they had performed the service, commenced life without any capital, by their industry and frugality, became rich, and some of their descendants are now among the wealthiest farmers in Pennsylvania. Many of these German Redemptioners rose to distinction. Some of their descendants are among the most prominent and wealthy citizens of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia.

Does not the history of the Germans, in this country, confirm the declaration of Samuel? "The Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich, he bringeth low, and lifteth up. He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill." (1 Sam. 2 : 7—8.)

ARTICLE XIII.

SCHMID'S DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.* TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN AND LATIN.

By CHARLES A. HAY, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

CHAPTER II.† *Of the Sacred Scriptures.*

In treating of the Sacred Scriptures as the recorded revelation of God, we speak (1) of what is understood by the Sacred Scriptures and Inspiration; (2) of the Attributes of the Sacred Scriptures; (3) of the Canon.

§6. *Of the terms Sacred Scriptures and Inspiration.*

God determined that his revelation should be committed

*Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, dargestellt und aus der Quellen belegt von Heinrich Schmid, Dr. und Professor der Theologie in Erlangen. Dritte Auflage, 1853.

†For the translation of the first three chapters of the Prolegomena see *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, vol. XIX., p. 259 sq.

to writing, so that it might be preserved pure and uncorrupted throughout all future time:¹ therefore he has deposited it in the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.² These are, therefore, defined to be the written Word of God.³ GERHARD: "The Sacred Scriptures are the Word of God recorded in the sacred writings." Between these and the Word of God there is, then, no real distinction, inasmuch as they contain nothing more than this very Word of God, which was also orally proclaimed;⁴ and they contain it entire and complete, so that aside from them, no Word of God is anywhere to be found.⁵ By the fact that the Sacred Scriptures are the Word of God, they distinguish themselves from all other books, for, in consequence of this, they are, in respect of all their contents, entirely divine; and this by virtue of the fact that they were communicated by inspiration from God, to the prophets and apostles.⁶ God is therefore their author, (*causa principalis*) and the prophets and apostles only the instruments (*causa instrumentalis*) which God employed in their production.⁷ We are, therefore, to ascribe the origin of the Sacred Scriptures to a peculiar agency of God, by means of which he urged the prophets and apostles to the production of the Sacred Scriptures,⁸ and communicated to them both the matter and the form of that which was to be written.⁹ This agency of God, by means of which the Sacred Scriptures were produced, we call *Inspiration*.¹⁰ BAIER: "Divine inspiration was that agency by which God supernaturally communicated to the intellect of those who wrote not only the correct conception of all that was to be written, but also the conception of the words themselves and of everything by which they were to be expressed, and by which he also instigated their will to the act of writing." Hence it follows, that everything that is contained in the Sacred Scriptures, is altogether, and in every particular, true and free from all error."

¹CHEMNITZ (Exam. Conc. Trid.) "We show * * why and wherefore the Sacred Scriptures were written; because, viz., by tradition purity of doctrine was not preserved; but, under shelter of that term many strange and false things were mingled up with the true."

GERHARD. "Why did God desire his word, at first orally promulgated, to be committed to writing?" The principal causes appear to have been the following: 1. The shortness of human life. 2. The

great number of men. 3. The unfaithfulness to be expected from the guardianship of tradition. 4. The weakness of the human memory. 5. The permanence of heavenly truth. 6. The wickedness of man. 7. (In the New Testament) The perverseness of heretics, which was to be held in check."

²GERHARD. "The Scriptures have their designation from the formal, external act, viz., that of writing, by which the Word of God, at first orally promulgated, was, by the command of God, recorded. God himself made the grand and majestic beginning of this work when he inscribed his law on Mt. Sinai, upon tables of stone, which, on this account, are called 'the writing of God,' Ex. 32 : 16. To distinguish them from all other writings, they are called *the Sacred Scriptures*, an appellation derived from Rom. 1 : 2, and 2 Tim. 3 : 15. The reasons of this designation are drawn 1. From their original efficient cause, their great author, who is God most holy, yea holiness itself, Is. 6 : 3; Dan. 9 : 24; 2. From their instrumental cause, viz., holy men, 2 Pet. 1 : 21; 3. From their matter, for they contain holy and divine mysteries, holy precepts, Ps. 105 : 42; 4. From their design and effects, for the Holy Spirit sanctifies men through the reading and study of the Scriptures, Jno. 17 : 17. 5. From the additional circumstance that they are widely different from all other writings, both ecclesiastical and profane, inasmuch as they are clothed with the sublime attribute of canonical authority, to which every believing and pious mind pays due deference."

Terms synonymous with Sacred Scripture, are γραφή or γραφαί, Jno. 7 : 38 and 42; Acts 8 : 12; Rom. 4 : 3. γραφαί ἀγίας, Rom. 1 : 2. ἐν γραμματι, 2 Tim. 3 : 15; γραφή θεοπνευστος, v. 16. Titles of honor which are attributed to the Word of God in Scripture, are the following: \logia τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. 3 : 2; \logos τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. 4 : 12; \logos τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου, Jno. 6 : 68. The whole collection is termed \logos Josh. 1 : 8; \logos Is. 34 : 16; \logos Neh. 8 : 8."—GERHARD.

²GERHARD. "The Holy Scriptures are the Word of God reduced to writing, according to his will, by the prophets, evangelists and apostles, perfectly and perspicuously setting forth the doctrine of the nature and will of God, that men may thereby be brought unto eternal life."

HOLLAZIUS. "In the definition of the Holy Scriptures, the Word of God signifies formally the purpose of God, or the conception of the divine mind, revealed for the salvation of men immediately to the prophets and apostles, and mediately, through their ministrations, to the whole race of man."

For the sake of the greatest possible accuracy, the following distinctions are made; GERHARD: "By the term Scripture, we are not to understand so much *the external form*, or sign, *i. e.*, the particular letters employed, the art of writing and the expressions by which the divine revelation is described, as *the matter itself or the thing signified*, just that which is marked and represented by the writing, *viz.*, the Word of God itself, which instructs us concerning the nature and will of God. For, as in all writing, performed by an intelligent agent, so also in these prophetic and apostolic writings, two things are to be considered, *viz.*, in the first place, the letters, syllables and sentences which are written, and which are external symbols signifying and expressing conceptions of the mind; and, secondly, those conceptions themselves, which are the thing signified, expressed by these external symbols of letters, syllables and sentences; wherefore in the term Scriptures we embrace *both of these*, and the latter especially." According as the term is taken in one or the other of these significations, the relation of the Church to the Scriptures is differently expressed." GERHARD: "Whence we add, by way of corollary, that certain things are predicated of Scripture, *with reference to its matter*, as that it is more ancient than the Church, that it is the very Word of God itself, formerly preached orally by the apostles and prophets; and others *in reference to its form*, as that it is, in point of time, later than the Church, that at the last day it will perish, whilst, on the other hand, as to its matter, it can never be destroyed or perish, Jno. 10 : 35."

GERARD. "That there is no real difference between the Word of God and the Sacred Scriptures, viewed in reference to the matter contained in them, is proved, 1. By the subject matter of Scripture. The prophets and apostles wrote that, and nothing else, which, taught by divine inspiration, they had before preached orally, 1 Cor. 15 : 1; 2 Cor. 1 : 13; Phil. 3 : 1; 2 Thess. 2 : 15; 1 Jno. 1 : 3. 2. By the identity of the spoken and written word. Because the recorded predictions of the Old Testament are frequently quoted in the New with these words: 'That it might be fulfilled which was *spoken* by the prophets,' Matt. 1 : 22, 2 : 15, 4 : 14, &c. Therefore, what the prophets said or predicted, is the same as that which they wrote. 3. By the rule of logic: 'The accident does not alter the essence.' It is a mere circumstance in regard to the Word of God, whether it be proclaimed orally or committed to writing. It is one and the same Word of God, whether it be presented to us in the form of spoken or written language; since neither the original efficient cause, nor the matter, nor the internal power, nor the object, is thereby changed, but only the mode of presentation by the use of different organs. 4. By the demonstrative particle employed by the apostles.

Paul speaks thus distinctively of the Mosaic writings and the other like books of the Old and New Testament: "*τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως*," "this is the word of faith," Rom. 10 : 8; Peter, in 1 Pet. 1 : 25.

CALVIUS. The fanatical sects, especially, deny that the Scriptures are, strictly speaking, the Word of God, maintaining that the internal Word of God alone can properly be called the Word of God. (Schwenckfeld, Rathmann, Weigel.)

²GERHARD. "1. This distinction (viz., that of the Papists between the written and unwritten Word) may, in a certain sense, be admitted, viz., if by the term 'unwritten Word' is understood the divine revelation proclaimed orally by the patriarchs before the Mosaic books were written, but *after the publication of the Scripture canon there can be no unwritten Word of God, as distinct from Scripture.*

2. We must distinguish between the leading truths of divine revelation which are necessary, essential, &c., and their more full explanation. The prophets and apostles committed to writing the principal doctrines of revelation, which are necessary to be known by all, and which we do not deny that they explained orally at greater length."

³QUENSTEDT. "The internal form, or that which gives existence to the Scriptures, so that they are indeed the Word of God, that, namely, which constitutes them and distinguishes them from all other writings, is the inspired (*θεοπνευστος*) sense of Scripture, which, in general, is the conception of the Divine Intellect concerning divine mysteries and our salvation, formed from eternity, and revealed in time and communicated in writing to us; or, it is divine inspiration itself (*θεοπνευστια*) 2 Tim. 3 : 16, by which, namely, the divine Word is imparted and is distinguished from that which is human."

⁷QUENSTEDT. "The *efficient* or principal cause of Scripture, is the triune God, 2 Tim. 3 : 16 (the Father, Heb. 1 : 1; the Son, Jno. 1 : 18, and the Holy Spirit, 2 Sam. 23 : 2; 1 Pet. 1 : 11; 2 Pet. 1 : 21); 1. By an original decree. 2. By subsequent inspiration, or by ordering that holy men of God should write, and by inspiring what was to be written."

GERHARDT. "The *instrumental causes* of Sacred Scripture were holy men of God, 2 Pet. 1 : 21, i. e., men peculiarly and immediately elected and called by God for the purpose of committing to writing the divine revelations; such were the prophets of the Old Testament and the evangelists and apostles of the New Testament; whom, therefore, we properly call *the amanuenses of God, the hand of Christ and the scribes or notaries of the Holy Spirit*, since they neither spoke nor wrote by their own human will, but, borne along by the Holy Spirit (*φερόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου*) were acted upon.

led, driven, inspired and governed by the Holy Spirit. They wrote not as men, but as men of God, *i. e.*, as servants of God and peculiar organs of the Holy Spirit. When, therefore, a canonical book is called a book of Moses, the psalms of David, an epistle of Paul, &c., this is merely a reference to the agent, not to the principal cause.

QUENSTEDT. "God therefore, alone, if we wish to speak accurately, is to be called the author of the Sacred Scriptures; the prophets and apostles cannot be called the authors, except by a kind of catachresis." To the remark that prophets and apostles may be called the amanuenses of God, Quenstedt adds: "And not as though these divine amanuenses wrote ignorantly and unwillingly, beyond the reach of and contrary to their own will; for they wrote cheerfully, willingly and intelligently. They are said to be *ᾠημένοι*, driven, moved, urged on by the Holy Spirit, not as though they were in a state of unconsciousness, as the Enthusiasts pretended to be, and as the heathen feigned was the case with their soothsayers (*εὐνοιαστοί*, in an ecstatic state); nor, further, by any means, as though the prophets themselves did not understand their own prophecies or the things which they wrote, which was formerly * * the error of the Montanists; but, because they wrote nothing of their own accord, but everything at the dictation of the Holy Spirit." Inasmuch as it holds good of all the sacred writers, that they are inspired, those are also accounted such who were not, in the strictest sense, apostles. HOLLAZIUS. "By the name apostles, we here designate those holy men of God, who, after the birth of Christ, wrote the Scriptures of the New Testament; although they did not all belong to the college of the apostles, chosen by Christ, before his ascension, to teach all nations; but who, after Christ's ascension, were numbered with the apostles; such were Matthias (whose writings, however, we do not possess) and Paul. But also those apostolic men, nearest to the apostles in office and dignity, are called apostles in a wider sense; such are Mark and Luke, the evangelists, cf. Rom. 16 : 7.

•HOLLAZIUS. "*Θεοπνευστία* (inspiration) denotes as well the antecedent divine instigation or peculiar impulse of the will to engage in writing as the immediate illumination by which the mind of the sacred writer is fully enlightened through the supernatural illumination of divine grace, and the conceptions of the things to be written are themselves suggested immediately by the Holy Spirit." The coöperation which here takes place on the part of God is described by Quenstedt as "*a special and extraordinary concurrence, peculiar to the sacred writers,*" and to be carefully distinguished from "*the general and common concurrence of God, by which God concurs in every action, by whomsoever performed,*" and the "*special or gracious concurrence of God, by virtue of which God*

is present to all believers sincerely meditating upon, and writing about, sacred things." Hollazius distinguishes between inspiration and the divine supervision. "For the latter merely guards against any thing being written that is not true, becoming, congruous; whereas the former, through the Holy Spirit dictating, suggests the conceptions of the things to be written. The divine supervision would warrant the infallibility of the Sacred Scriptures but not their inspiration." If the impulse to engage in writing is embraced under the term inspiration, then it follows that all the Sacred Scriptures were written by the command of God, because all are inspired. QUENSTEDT. "All the canonical books, both of the Old and New Testaments, were written by God, who peculiarly incited and impelled the sacred writers to engage in the work, and, therefore, the Scriptures of the New Testament were recorded according to the command and will of God by the evangelists and apostles."

The opposite view is that held by the Papists, who foolishly assert that the evangelists and apostles did not write by any divine command, but were incidentally urged by some accidental circumstance originating elsewhere, or by necessity. It is, indeed, granted that we do not possess the proof of an express and outward command of God in the case of each of the sacred writings, but it is at the same time observed that the want of this is not felt where the *impulse* exists. GERHARD. "In the holy men of God, the external command and the internal impulse correspond to each other. For what else is that divine impulse than an internal and secret command of precisely the same authority and weight with one that is external and manifest?" The latter is proved (by Hollazius, but also in the same manner by all the earlier writers) to have existed in the case of all the books of Scripture: "1. By the general command of Christ, Matt. 18 : 19. (Gerhard: Those who were commanded to teach all nations, were also commanded to reduce their teachings to writing; for they could not teach all nations, even of the succeeding age, orally and without writing.) 2. By the impulse of the Holy Spirit, which Peter teaches, 2 Pet. 1 : 21. 3. By the divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, which Paul inculcates, 2 Tim. 3 : 16. 4. By the apostolic office, in which those holy men became the ambassadors of God, 2 Cor. 5 : 20. Ambassadors are restricted by the commands of their sovereign. Peter, as an ambassador of God, did not undertake to preach to the Gentiles without a divine command; therefore still less would he dare to write an epistle unless commanded by God." That, however, the external instigations alluded to in the antithesis of the Papists are not excluded, Gerhard had already stated. "The inducements to engage in writing brought to bear upon the apostles from without, do not annul the internal command, but rather confirm it, since those circumstances were made to influence the apostles

by the wonderful arrangement of divine providence, and to them was subsequently added the interior impulse of the Holy Spirit, urged on by which they applied their hand to the work."

"Hereby a real and a verbal inspiration are asserted, from which it follows that there is absolutely nothing in the Holy Scriptures that is not inspired. These assertions are contained in the following two sentences (of Hollazius):

"I. The conceptions of all that is contained in the Sacred Scriptures were immediately communicated by the Holy Spirit to the prophets and apostles.

II. All the words, without exception, contained in the sacred manuscript, were dictated by the Holy Spirit to the pen of the prophets and apostles."

These two sentences we illustrate by the following remarks of Quenstedt and Hollazius. In reference to No. I. "In inspiration we recognize 'a divine assistance and direction, which includes the inspiration and dictation of the Holy Spirit; but we deny as insufficient such a bare divine assistance and direction, which simply prevents the sacred writers from departing from the truth in speaking and writing. * * The Holy Spirit guides others also in writing, i. e., so that we observe here a difference in this respect, that the Holy Spirit so directed the inspired (*θιοκρινους*) men, that he at the same time suggested and communicated all things to them in so far as they are recorded in Scripture."—*Quenstedt*.

2. Inspiration embraces all that is contained in Scripture, and therefore also those things which could have been otherwise known to the apostles and prophets, because in this case it was necessary that these things should be said just at the particular time when the design which God had in view required it. HOLLAZIUS: "The things which were known to the sacred writers, may be considered either absolutely and in themselves, or relatively, in reference to the purpose of God to have them written. For, although the sacred amanuenses may have known certain things, which are described by them, before the act of writing, yet it was not, in the nature of the case, known to them, *whether God desired these things to be described, or under what circumstances, in what order and with what words they should be committed to writing.*"

3. In like manner, inspiration embraces things that are not of a spiritual nature. HOLLAZIUS: "There are contained in Scripture historical, chronological, genealogical, astrolological, natural-historical and political matters, which, although the knowledge of them is not actually necessary to salvation, are nevertheless divinely revealed, because an acquaintance with them assists not a little in the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures and in illustrating the doctrines and

moral precepts. If only the mysteries of the faith, which are contained in the Sacred Scriptures, depend upon divine inspiration, and all the rest, which may be known by the light of nature, depends merely upon the divine direction, then the whole of Scripture is not inspired. But Paul declares that the whole of Scripture is divinely inspired. Therefore not only the mysteries of the faith, but also the remaining truths that may be known by the light of nature, which are contained in Scripture, are divinely suggested and inspired. Therefore, 4. Even apparently unimportant matters are, by all means, to be regarded as also inspired." QUENSTEDT: "A matter may be of small moment, considered in itself and with reference to the estimation in which it is held by men, and yet of great importance if we regard the end and wise design which God has in view with regard to it. Many things in Scripture seem to be of small account (2 Tim. 4 : 13), in regard to which some suppose that our theory of inspiration derogates from the dignity of the Holy Spirit, but they are, nevertheless, of great moment, if we regard the end had in view (Rom. 15 : 4) and the allwise design of God, in accordance with which these things were introduced into the Scriptures." CALIXTUS (in Quenstedt) is a prominent advocate of the opposite view, viz.: "Neither is it taught in Scripture, that it is necessary to ascribe all the particulars that are contained in it to a peculiar divine revelation, but that the principal topics, those which the Scripture is mainly and peculiarly designed to teach, viz.: those which relate to the redemption and salvation of the human race, are to be ascribed solely to that particular divine revelation; but, that in writing concerning other things, known in some other way, either by experience or the light of nature, the writers were so directed by the divine assistance and by the Holy Spirit, that they wrote nothing but what was suited to the subject in hand, true, becoming and congruous." The proof of plenary inspiration is drawn 1. From 2 Tim. 3 : 16. (QUENSTEDT: "The word *πασα* may be taken distributively, of the single books or parts of Scripture, or collectively for those parts taken as a whole so that *πασα* is the same as *ἅη*; in either case our opinion remains true, viz., that all Scripture is inspired.") Whence the following argument: CALOVIUS: "If all Scripture be inspired, (*θεοπνευστος*), then there can be nothing in the Holy Scriptures that was not divinely suggested and by inspiration communicated to those who wrote. For if even a single particle of Scripture were derived from human knowledge and memory of revelation, then it could not be asserted that all Scripture is divinely inspired. 2. From 2 Pet. 1 : 21, (although Peter does not allude particularly to writing but speaking * * * yet by *λαλῶν* both speaking and writing are here implied, and both are compre-

hended under this term; cf. Acts 2 : 31; 3 : 24; Rom. 3 : 19; for just as the holy men of God were incited and impelled by the Holy Spirit to speak, so were they also incited and impelled by him to write.) 3. By the promise of Christ, Jno. 14 : 26. 4. From 1 Cor. 2 : 10: We add, from Calovius, the following additional proofs: "From the originating cause of Scripture, if indeed the sacred writers were merely the pen, the hand or the amanuenses of the Holy Spirit; from the nature of the direction of the Holy Spirit, which is usually described as such that the Scriptures were written by his direction, wherefore Gregory the Great declared that the whole of the Sacred Scriptures were nothing more nor less than a letter from God the Creator to man his creature; from the equal authority of all that is contained in Scripture. For not merely those things which directly refer to the subjects of faith and salvation are the Word of God, but every thing that is found in Scripture, Rom. 4 : 12, and, for the same reason that they are called by this name, they well deserve to be regarded as the immediate Word of God."

In relation to No. II. HOLLAZIUS: "[The divine inspiration of the words, also, known by common usage] was necessary to the proper expression of the mind of the Holy Spirit. For the prophets and apostles were not at liberty to clothe the divine meaning in those words which they might of their own accord select; but it was their duty to adhere to, and depend upon, the oral dictation of the Holy Spirit, so that they might commit the Sacred Scriptures to writing, in the order and connection so graciously and excellently given, and in which they would appear in perfect accordance with the mind of the Holy Spirit." Quenstedt thus accounts for the variety of style: "There is a great diversity among the sacred writers, in regard to style and mode of speaking, which appears to arise from this fact, that the Holy Spirit accommodated himself to the ordinary mode of speaking, leaving to each one his own manner; yet we do not thereby deny that the Holy Spirit suggested the particular words to these individuals. But all are not satisfied with this opinion * * and some suppose the cause of the diversity of style to be, 'because the Holy Spirit allowed every one to speak as he pleased,' Acts 2 : 4, and that he regarded not so much the character of the authors' style as the nature of the things concerning which he wished them to speak or write. The inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points was included in this theory, cf. Gerhard's argument *ex absurdo*: "It would follow that the single words of Scripture were not communicated by God through the prophets, * * therefore not all Scripture is inspired." From the theory of verbal inspiration there arose also the assertion: "The style of the New Testament is free from every trace of barbarisms and solecisms," (Quenstedt.) The proof of verbal inspiration was

drawn, 1. From 2 Tim. 3 : 16. (All Scripture is wholly inspired, not only its meaning, or the thing signified, but also the words, as signs of things, were divinely inspired. Therefore, &c., &c.) 2. From 1 Cor. 2 : 13; Ex. 34 : 27, 28; Matt. 5 : 18.

° *Inspiration* is, therefore, a divine agency employed in connection with the recording of the truth, and, in several respects, it differs from *revelation*.

If we consider the latter as embracing the whole compass of Christian faith, it owes its very existence to inspiration; CALOVIVS: "Divine inspiration may be regarded either as the *source and efficient cause* of revelation, which is what God accomplishes through inspiration, or as the *form* which revelation assumes, or the revealed Word." But if revelation be taken in its etymological sense, as the communication of that which was before unknown, then it differs from inspiration in the following respects: 1. The latter may contain also that which was before known, merely specifying the particular time and manner in which it is to be consummated, and, 2. The subject-matter of revelation may be communicated to man in various ways, but that of inspiration only by an immediate divine suggestion. QUENSTEDT: "*Revelation*, formally and etymologically viewed, is the manifestation of things unknown and hidden, and can be made in many and various ways, viz., by outward speech, or by dreams and visions. *Inspiration* is that act of the Holy Spirit, by which an actual knowledge of things is supernaturally conveyed to an intelligent creature, or it is an internal suggestion or infusion of conceptions, whether the things conceived were previously known to the writer or not. The former could precede the commitment to writing, the latter was always associated with it and flowed over into the writing itself." Add to this the remarks: "With all this I do not deny that divine inspiration itself may be called revelation, in a certain sense, in so far, namely, as it is a manifestation of certain circumstances, as also of the order and manner in which certain things are to be written. (We must distinguish between divine revelation when by it the subject-matter itself is made known, and when it refers to the peculiar circumstances and time and manner and order, in which the subject-matter is to be reduced to writing.) And *when, also*, revelation concurs and coincides with divine inspiration, when, viz., the divine mysteries are revealed by inspiration and inspired by revelation, in the very act of writing. Thus Calovius very properly remarks: "That all the particulars contained in the Sacred Scriptures are not, indeed, to be regarded as having been received by a peculiar and new revelation, but by the special dictation, inspiration and suggestion of the Holy Spirit.

"HOLLAZIUS. "Divine inspiration, by which the subject-matter and the words to be spoken, as well as those to be written, were immediately suggested to the prophets and apostles by the Holy Spirit, preserved them free from all error, as well in the preaching as in the writing of the divine Word."

CALOVIVS. "No error, even in unimportant matters, no defect of memory, not to say untruth, can have any place in all the Sacred Scriptures."

QUENSTEDT. "We are to distinguish between the conversation of the apostles and their preaching and writing; or between infirmities in conduct and errors in doctrine. In doctrine the apostles never could err, after receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, * * but in their conduct and outward conversation they were not sinless (*ἀναμάρτητος*), but, in consequence of innate original corruption, were still subject to infirmities and failings."

The more accurate development of the doctrine of inspiration begins with Gerhard. Hutter (*Loci Theologici*) still thus briefly expresses himself in regard to it: "Although God did not directly write the Scriptures, but used prophets and apostles as his pen and instrument, yet the Scripture is not, on that account, of any the less authority. For it is God, and indeed God alone, who inspired the prophets and apostles, not only as they spoke, but also as they wrote; and he made use of their lips, their tongues, their hands, their pen. Therefore, or in this respect, the Scriptures also, as they are, were written by God himself. For the prophets and apostles were merely instruments." This contains, however, essentially everything that we have adduced above from the later theologians. It was mainly the controversy with the Roman Catholics that gave occasion to detailed specifications; for these very well knew that they would rob the Protestant Church of all its weapons, without thereby injuring themselves, if they could cast suspicion upon the true inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. And then such discriminations were also called forth in part by the fanatics, who treated the written Word of God with little respect; partly by the Socinians and Arminians, who adhered to a merely partial inspiration of the Scriptures. In opposition to these, it became of great importance to the Lutheran theologians to defend the doctrine, not only of the real, but also of the verbal inspiration in its fullest extent."

ARTICLE XIV.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with special reference to Ministers and Students. By John Peter Lange, D. D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, and edited, with additions. By Philip Schaff, D. D., assisted by American scholars of various evangelical denominations. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The last volume of this great Bible-work, the ninth in the series so far presented to the American public, contains the book of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, by Dr. Otto Zückler, Professor of Theology at Greifswald, in Pomerania, the author of a number of historical and exegetical works, who, in his introduction, exhausts the whole subject of the meaning, authorship and literature of the Solomonic writings. The Commentary on Proverbs is translated by Dr. Aiken, and, in addition to the translation, contains a large amount of original matter. The Editor of Ecclesiastes is Dr. Lewis, who gives annotations, and dissertations, on leading ideas, with a metrical version and an introduction, but the work of translation was performed by Prof. Wells. The Song of Solomon is edited by Prof. Green, who is not only its translator, but, with good taste and judgment, has made important additions to the work. The volume partakes of the general characteristics, thought, learning and labor, of this remarkable production, and will be found eminently worthy to take a position with the other volumes of the series, so valuable to the scholar.

The Gospel according to Matthew: With Notes intended for Sabbath Schools, Families and Ministers. By N. M. Williams. With Illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. This Commentary has been written in the interests of the Baptist denomination, and the results of the latest biblical and critical researches are given. The notes are chiefly explanatory, yet the doctrinal and practical are also introduced. Except where the author's peculiar ecclesiastical system differs from that in which we were educated, we think well of his comments.

The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, translated from the original Hebrew. With a Commentary, Critical, Philological and Exegetical. By E. Henderson, D. D. Andover: W. F. Draper. This Commentary, like that on the Minor Prophets and other books of the Old Testament, by the same author, is very satisfactory. On every page it gives evidence of careful research and critical scholarship. It avoids all fanciful interpretation; its expositions are marked by practical good sense. The work deserves a place in the Library of every biblical student.

Essays on some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion. By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. Andover: W. F.

Draper. This is a republication of a popular work that has passed through seven London editions, and is the substance of a series of discourses, delivered by the distinguished author before the University of Oxford. The contents embrace the following discussions: (1) Revelation of a Future State; (2) The Declaration of God in his Son; (3) Love to Christ, as a Motive to Obedience; (4) The Practical Character of Revelation; (5) The Example of Children as proposed to Christians; (6) The Omission of a System of Articles of Faith, Liturgies and Ecclesiastical Canons. Appended to the volume is the author's famous essay, designated: Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Buonaparte.

The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. By Henry C. Alexander. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The subject of this *Memoir*, was a most remarkable man. He was regarded as one of the ablest scholars of his day, a prince among preachers, and in the department to which he specially devoted himself, he achieved a high reputation. His wealth of learning he applied to the elucidation of God's Word and the cause of Christian truth. His biography, so full, faithful and appreciative, richly deserves study. It furnishes stimulus for the mind and the heart. It portrays the nobility of a true man, the career of a great Christian scholar, and magnifies the grace of God. To the general reader the work would, perhaps, be more valuable, if the matter were compressed into half the space, and less attention given to minute details, and irrelevant discussion.

Memoir of the Life of the Right Reverend George Burgess, D. D., First Bishop of Maine. Edited by Rev. A. Burgess, D. D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This is an interesting *Memoir* of an eminent divine in the Episcopal Church, a fine scholar, an earnest Christian, evangelical in his views and conservative in practice, resembling, in many respects, the celebrated Dr. Arnold of Rugby. He was useful in his life and honored in his death.

Man in Genesis and Geology: or the Biblical Account of Man's Creation, tested by Scientific Theories of his Origin and Antiquity. By Joseph P. Thompson, D. D., LL. D. New York: S. R. Wells. This able and attractive discussion is embraced in seven Lectures: (1) The Outline of Creation in Genesis; (2) The Creation of Man; (3) The Origin of Man; (4) Man's Dominion over Nature; (5) The Antiquity of Man; (6) The Sabbath made for Man; (7) Woman and the Family. With great skill and candor the learned author grapples with the questions, raised by Science as against Revelation, and with convincing force shows, that the one is never in conflict with the other. *Nunquam aliud Natura, aliud Sapientia dicit*. The volume, we are sure, will aid in the dissemination of sound views of the interpretation of the Bible in its references to the phenomena of Nature.

Ecce Caelum; or Parish Astronomy. In Six Lectures. By a Connecticut Pastor. Eighth Edition. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. This is one of the most attractive books on the moral uses of Astronomy since the appearance of Dr. Chalmers' *Astronomical Discourses*. In thought and diction, it is worthy of that eminent preacher. The author writes with a clear and full understanding of the subject, with the rare gift of presenting abstruse truths in popular form, and in an earnest Christian spirit. The discussion establishes, from the discoveries of modern Astronomers, the existence of God, and, indirect-

ly, the truth of the gospel in a masterly argument, as instructive as it is intensely interesting.

Pater Mundi; or Modern Science testifying to the Heavenly Father. Being in substance Lectures delivered to Senior Classes in Amherst College. By E. F. Burr, D. D. In two volumes. Vol. I. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. These Lectures have been endorsed, in the strongest language, by the most eminent critics. They are a seasonable and substantial addition to the literature of the subject, and will be read with the deepest interest by all, who desire to study the relation of science to religion. They are characterized by clearness of thought, vigor of argument, and amplitude of rich and apposite illustration.

God's Thoughts fit Bread for Children. By Horace Bushnell, D. D. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. This Discourse, delivered before the Connecticut Sunday School Teachers' Convention, and published by request of the Convention, is full of fresh and exhaustive instruction and suggestions on the mission and modes of Christian teaching.

Lamps, Pitchers and Trumpets. Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher. Illustrated by Anecdotes, Biographical, Historical and Elucidatory, of every order of Pulpit Eloquence, from the Great Preachers of all Ages. By Edwin P. Hood. New York: M. W. Dodd. This is the second series of the work, and contains five Lectures on the following subjects: (1) The Pulpit of our Age and Times; (2) On Arrangement of Texts by Divisions; (3) Concerning Written and Extemporary Sermons; (4) On Effective Preaching, and the Foundation of Legitimate Success; (5) On the Mental Tools and Apparatus needful for the Pulpit, with Pulpit Monographs on Robertson, Pusey, Manning, Newman, Spurgeon, Lacordaire and Binney. The author aims to connect instruction with abundant illustration, and we regret that he has so far yielded to the sensational style of the present day, as to adopt a title, which conveys no idea of the character of his admirable Lectures.

Immortality. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. J. Stewart Perowne, D. D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in St. David's College, Lampeter, &c. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. These Lectures, by one who has carefully studied the subject, discusses: (1) The Future Life; (2) The Hope of the Gentile; (3) The Hope of the Jew; (4) The Hope of the Christian. Discussions of this kind, always of intrinsic interest, possess a more than ordinary importance at the present time, when materialistic sentiments are so rapidly spreading, and when scepticism assails not only the divine origin of the Scriptures, but the immortality of the soul and the very existence of God. From the careful consideration and earnest investigation of these questions, we cannot escape.

Stepping Heavenward. By E. Prentiss. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Mrs. Prentiss is very successful as a writer for juvenile and other readers. In the present narrative, she shows how full of incidents are the ways of Providence, and, if rightly improved, they ripen the Christian for heaven. The book is natural, free from all cant, stereotype phrases and morbid tendencies. The religion, it advocates, is intelligent and cheerful, full of love and good works, calculated to impress with nobler views of duty and higher aims of life.

The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth. By William Hanna, D. D., LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. Dr. Hanna, who is well known as the biographer of Dr. Chalmers, is a fine biblical scholar, and his personal familiarity of the scenes of the gospel narrative, has enabled him to produce a work abounding in vivid and picturesque description of character and place. There is no parade of learning, but it is evident on every page, that the author is thoroughly acquainted with the results of modern criticism and research. The work is written in an evangelical spirit, and is pervaded with a deep sense of the divine in the human.

The Ministry in Galilee. By William Hanna, D. D., LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This is the second volume in the series, and possesses all the interest of the first. The volume is rich in graphic description, in vivid representations of such subjects as the Leper and the Paralytic—the Raising of the Widow's Son and the Ruler's Daughter—the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Walking upon the Water—the Syro-Phœnician Woman—the Circuit through Decapolis—the Apostolic-Confession at Cæsarea-Philippi, the Transfiguration, and other Scenes connected with the Saviour's ministry in Galilee.

Light and Truth; or Bible Thoughts and Themes. The Acts and the Larger Epistles. By Horatius Bonar, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This volume consists of eighty-three brief, practical expositions of passages in the Acts, Romans and Corinthians, written in an elevated and fervid strain of piety, which has rendered Dr. Bonar so acceptable as a religious writer. The author is a firm believer in the premillennial advent, and yet, except in a few passages, the reader can scarcely discover the fact.

The Spirit of Life: or Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost. By E. Bickersteth, M. A. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This book is an enlargement and revision of one of the chapters of a previous publication, entitled the "Rock of Ages," and consists of nine chapters: (1) The Witness of Scripture; (2) The Distinct Personality of the Holy Spirit; (3) The Eternal Godhead of the Holy Spirit anointing the Son of Man; (5) The Spirit, the Author of Holy Scripture; (6) The Holy Spirit striving with the World; (7) The Holy Scripture quickening the Soul of Life; (8) The Holy Spirit sanctifying the Believer; (9) The Issue of the Holy Spirit's Work. The discussion is clear, candid and scriptural, establishing beyond all doubt, in an elaborate and comprehensive argument, the doctrine of the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, and fortifying every point with scriptural references and illustrations.

Removing Mountains: Life Lessons from the Gospels. By John S. Hart, LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. Professor Hart never touches any subject which he does not adorn. His discussions in this volume, fifty-two in number, are fresh, earnest, practical presentations of scriptural truth, with pertinent application to the wants and demands of the present. They are admirably adapted to daily, or Sunday reading.

Words of Comfort for Parents bereaved of Little Children. Edited by William Logan, Glasgow, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. The contents of this volume are made up of selections, in prose and poetry, taken from many of the best writers, and de-

signed to soothe and comfort those who have been bereaved of loved ones. They are full of beautiful thought and tender pathos, but it may be questioned whether the influence of such books is always healthful.

Fergus Morton: A Story of the Scottish Boy. By J. R. Macduff, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. This is a most excellent Sunday School Book, showing the power of the Bible, and forcibly illustrating the truth: "Commit thy ways unto the Lord; trust also in Him, and He shall bring it to pass."

The Gates Ajar. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. Although this book has been, for some time, before the public, it is only recently that we have had an opportunity of reading it, and we have been most agreeably disappointed in its character. It is not so materialistic in its tendency as has been represented. It is true, it differs from many of the popular notions of heaven, entertained often by good people. But our hymns and many of the books abound in similar language. The writer speaks of material enjoyments, in the better life, in the same sense in which the Bible speaks of pearly gates and golden streets, the crown and the harp; the wants of our changed natures will be fully answered and gratified. The book is full of pathos, genius and power. It is a story, designed to establish and enforce an opinion, and told with great dramatic skill. The cant and narrowness of religious orthodoxy, as we sometimes see it, is set forth and illustrated. A critical judgment may detect in the work some defects, but it certainly is not without great merit.

Truth Made Plain: or the Rudiments of the Christian Religion, for the use of Families, Sunday Schools and Bible Classes. Prepared by Joseph a Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Book and Tract Society of St. John's Church. This work had its origin in the wants of the Sabbath School of St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia, of which the author is the honored pastor, and, although prepared for that object, it may be used with advantage by other churches in the work of instructing the young in the elementary principles of the Christian religion. It is not designed to supersede Luther's Catechism, or "to improve upon its contents, but to digest and explain them."

Bible Gems: or Manual of Scripture Lessons. By R. E. Kremer. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. This book has received the cordial endorsement of the Hon. J. P. Wickersham, the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania, and of prominent teachers and pastors in the State. Although specially designed as a text-book in our public schools, it is equally adapted to the wants of the Sunday School and the household. It contains a large amount of biblical instruction, free from all denominational bias, the result of careful study, prepared with skill by an experienced and practical instructor of the young. The work is altogether worthy of the favor it has received.

Studies in Church History. The Rise of the Temporal power—Benefit of Clergy—Excommunication. By Henry C. Lea. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston. This volume discusses carefully, with great candor and ability, in a truly historical spirit, several important questions, connected with the history of the Church, in the form of historico-critical essays. The work is marked by the same erudition, clearness of thought and

force of expression that characterize the author's admirable treatise on "*Sacerdotal Celibacy*." The facts, from which the conclusions are drawn, are derived from a large range of authorities, many of them inaccessible to ordinary students of ecclesiastical history. The reader will find the work highly instructive, a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

The Christian Festivals. A Help to the Devout Observance of the Sacred Seasons of the Church. By A. Shiras, D. D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This volume, by a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, consists chiefly of sacred poems, adapted to the principal festivals in the ecclesiastical year, commemorative of the great facts in redemption, to special ordinances and the minor festivals. The selections, generally, are of a high character, and will be found useful in the cultivation of a devotional spirit.

Hints to Young Men on the True Relation of the Sexes. By John Ware, M. D. Boston: A Williams & Co. This little work was written by Dr. Ware, at the request of prominent Christian gentlemen, in the interests of a pure morality. Its design is to "place the relation of the sexes on its proper basis, to deter from vice by a just exposition of its nature, its dangers and its effects." There is nothing in the book suggestive of evil thoughts, or offensive to modesty. Necessary truth is presented in a form, which indicates the purity of the author's own mind, and his deep interest in the welfare of the young.

Our New Way Round the World. By Charles Carleton Coffin. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. This is a most instructive and readable book. The author, who gained a high reputation as the correspondent of the *Boston Journal* during the War, is a keen and practical observer, and an easy and graceful writer. The volume appears most opportunely at the time, when so many avenues are opening for Christian effort, in connection with those grand enterprises, that are girding the globe, and the empires of China and Japan are brought nearer to us than England was a half century ago, when God in his Providence is bidding us go forth, and possess the earth. We are glad to meet, in the work, with testimony so generous and strong in reference to the character and labors of our American Missionaries, with whom the author freely mingled.

Among My Books. By James Russell Lowell, A. M., Professor of Belles-Lettres in Harvard College. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. This volume is a collection of essays, originally prepared for the *North American Review*, and discusses the following subjects: Dryden, Witchcraft, Shakespeare, New England two centuries ago, Lessing and Rousseau. They are able papers, some of them among the finest specimens of criticism, altogether worthy of the author's high reputation.

China and the Chinese. By Rev. John L. Nevius. With a Map and Illustrations. New York: Harper and Bros. This volume contains a description of China and its population, its civilization and form of government, its religious and social institutions, its intercourse with other nations, and its present conditions and prospects. The author, who spent ten years of missionary life in the country, and is prepared to write intelligently on the subject, skilfully presents valuable and reliable information, the results of patient and careful observation. Since this vast and ancient empire has been brought

into new and more intimate, social and commercial, relations with this country, there will be a disposition to become more thoroughly acquainted with its history, literature, social and religious condition.

Henry J. Raymond and the New York Press for Thirty Years. Progress of American Journalism from 1840 to 1870. With Portrait Illustrations and Appendix. By Augustus Maverick. Hartford, Conn.: A. S. Hale & Co. This is a most interesting memorial of an able man, full of facts, incidents and personal reminiscences. It is not only, a very readable book, but a valuable contribution to biography, and to the history of American Journalism. The relations of the subject with the press and with politics, with public measures and with prominent characters, cannot fail to awaken in the work, written with so much delicacy and judgment, and in so clear and forcible a style, an abiding interest.

Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, relating to all Ages and Nations for universal reference. Edited by Rev. Benjamin Vincent, and revised for the use of American readers. New York: Harper & Bros. This valuable work, the result of years of toil, a chronicle as well as a chronology of the world's history, a digested summary of every department of human knowledge, has been brought down to the present time, carefully arranged and revised. It is, beyond doubt, the best and most complete work of the kind ever published.

The History of Rome. By Theodore Mommsen. Translated with the Author's sanction and additions by Rev. W. P. Dickson, D. D. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. The present maintains the same high character as the former volume. It is the best history extant of the period of which it treats, the most original and exhaustive investigation of the subject since the days of Niebuhr.

Classical Study: Its Value illustrated by extracts from the Writings of eminent Scholars. Edited with an Introduction by Samuel H. Taylor, LL. D., Principal of Phillips Academy. Andover: W. F. Draper. Dr. Taylor, himself a profound classical scholar, has given us, in this volume, a collection of essays from various authors, the testimony of a large number of distinguished scholars, some of the ablest thinkers of the age, both in this and other countries, as to the value of the critical and continuous study of the Greek and Roman classics, as an instrument in education. The work has grown out of the recent controversy in reference to the comparative importance of classical and scientific studies, and is designed to oppose the materializing tendencies of some of our educational theories. Not the least valuable part of the work is the Editor's valuable Introduction, in which, among other things, reasons are given why the rich benefit of classical studies are not more frequently attained.

The Odes and Epodes of Horace. A Metrical Translation into English. With Introduction and Commentaries. By Lord Lytton. New York: Harper & Brothers. By those who are interested in classical studies, this volume will be highly valued, not so much on account of the metrical translation, as for the critical notes which accompany the translation. The Introduction brings out, with great correctness, Horace's peculiar power, and assigns reasons for his great popularity in all ages.

T. Macci Plauti Captivi, Trinummus et Rudens. With English

VOL. XXI. No. 82. 41

Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By C. S. Harrington, M. A., Professor of Latin in the Wesleyan University. New York: Harper & Bros. These three Comedies by the great master of Roman Comedy, prepared with judicious notes, appropriate illustrations, and the explanation of the metres, will secure from the classical teachers of the land many thanks for the service which the Editor has rendered.

The Æneid of Publius Virgilius Maro, elucidated by English Notes, Critical, Historical and Mythological, with a Metrical Index and Map; and illustrated by antique statues, gems, coins and medals. To which is added a copious dictionary giving the meaning of all the words with critical exactness. By Nathan Covington Brooks, LL. D., President of the Baltimore Female College. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. This is just such an edition of Virgil as we would expect from Professor Brooks, whose whole life has been spent among classic authors, and devoted to the work of instruction. The pictorial illustrations are beautiful, impressing the pupil with the spirit of antique life and art, the notes are sufficiently ample, furnishing the help that is really necessary; and the references to parallelisms in other parts of the *Æneid* and in other productions, ancient and modern, must awaken a living interest in the author, exercise the judgment, and cultivate the critical taste of the student.

Flowers and Fossils, and other Poems. By John K. Stayman, Professor of Ancient Languages and Classical Literature in Dickinson College. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. We congratulate our friend, Professor Stayman, on his success in the cultivation of the Muses. We have no doubt it has been to him pleasant recreation, in connection with the multiplied and sterner duties of his profession. Some of the pieces possess more than ordinary merit.

Health by Good Living By W. W. Hall, M.D. New York: Hurd & Houghton. The author of this book is one of the most practical and sensible writers on the subject of health. Some excellent advice is given, and the importance of devoting proper attention to diet, air, exercise and rest, earnestly enforced. The work is free from all professional technicalities, and is suited to the wants of the general reader.

Dame Nature and her Three Daughters. A Grandpapa's Talks and Stories about Natural History and Things of Daily use. Translated from the French of X. B. Saintine. New York: Hurd & Houghton. This story has about it a purity, a grace, and a playfulness, which cannot fail to charm the youthful reader.

Old Horse Gray and the Parish of Grumbleton By Edward Hopper. New York: Hurd & Houghton. This is a pretty little story in verse, and deserves all the praise that has been bestowed upon it.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Prof. H. B. Hackett, D. D. With the cooperation of Ezra Abbott, LL. D. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Parts XII., XIII. and XIV. of this valuable Dictionary, which has so often been commended in our pages, are on our table. The work and is rapidly reaching a successful completion.

Christian Giving: A Discourse preached December 12th, 1869, in St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXXII.

Article.	Page
I. GOD'S CARE OF HIS CHURCH AS EXHIBITED IN THE REFORMATION,.....	157
By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.	
II. REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN MINISTERS,.....	171
III. LUTHER ON THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY,.....	182
By Rev. A. MARTIN, A. M. Professor in Pennsylvania College.	
IV. EXPOSITION OF LUKE 16 : 9,.....	191
By Rev. W. H. SETTLEMYER, A. M., Wilmore, Pa.	
V. THE IDEALISM OF BERKELEY,.....	200
VI. LONELINESS OF HAMLET,.....	210
By Rev. E. FERRIER, A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College.	
VII. KANZEL-GEMEINSCHAFT, OR EXCHANGE OF PULPITS,.....	224
By Rev. A. J. WEDDELL, A. M., Norristown, Pa.	
VIII. LIFE AND TIMES OF AMBROSE,	234
IX. THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST,.....	250
By H. L. BAUGHER, D. D., Late President of Pennsylvania College.	
X. MARTIN STEPHAN AND THE STEPHANITES,.....	259
XI. THE MEEKNESS OF MOSES,	283
By Rev. JACOB FREY, A. M., Reading, Pa.	
XII. THE NEW-LANDERS AND GERMAN REDEMP- TIONERS,.....	290
By Rev. R. WEISER, Mahanoy, Pa.	
XIII. SCHMID'S DOGMATIC THEOLOGY,.....	299
By CHARLES A. HAY, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.	
XIV. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....	311

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review* for January opens with a sermon on "The Importance and Connection of Works and Faith," by Dr. Webb. Dr. Lintner discusses "The Influence of Revivals." Reminiscences of G. B. Miller, D. D., are given. Prof. Loy discusses the Relation of "Piety and Property." President Valentine, "The Greatness of being Useful." Rev. J. A. Kunkelman considers the "Chinese Problem;" Rev. G. N. H. Peters, "The Ascensions of Christ," with much patient and minute scholarship; Prof. Harkey considers the question of "Close Communion in the Lutheran Church;" Prof. Baugher, "Christ's Prophecy of his Sufferings;" and Prof. Himes gives a learned account of the late "Total Eclipse of the Sun." It will be seen that this *Quarterly* means this year—as it has been used to do—to earn its money by good solid hard work, and plenty of it.—*Congregationalist and Boston Recorder*.

The *Review* is devoted to the exposition and defence of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, to Theological discussion, Biblical Criticism and Church History, by means of articles both original and translated from the German and other foreign journals. It is edited by Prof. M. L. Stöever, LL. D. of Pennsylvania College, who is one of the most genial, scholarly and large-hearted gentlemen in the Lutheran, or any other denomination.—*National Baptist*.

The number has an interesting variety of articles, and each one has its own attractive features. The "Biography of Dr. Miller" will be read with profound interest. The article on the "Ascensions of Christ" is attractive for its earnestness and its ability, for what may be called even its originality. The "Chinese Problem," though short is yet clear, thorough and timely. "Piety and Property" discusses an important question of Christian morals with great earnestness and accuracy, whilst the Sermon on "Revivals," the Sermon to "Young Men," and that on the "Passion" may be read with edification.—*Lutheran and Missionary*.

The article of Dr. Webb is a terse and practical discourse. Its simple directness of style and manner of illustration are quite refreshing. The article on "Revivals" is a judicious and useful presentation of the benefits of *Revivals* to the Lutheran Church with discriminating notices of some of the evils, which have sometimes attended them. The biographical sketch of Dr. Miller, written in the editor's best style, is a fitting tribute to the eminent worth of a great and good man.—*Lutheran Observer*.